5.3 B
44
c.5

New England Circle
Imperialist League

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

Class Book Volume

325.373 N44 v.5-6

Ja 09-20M

5373
44
v. 5

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY of ILLINOIS

You are earnestly asked to hand this after reading to some other person who will also give it careful consideration.

REPORT

OF THE

Fifth Annual Meeting

OF THE

NEW ENGLAND

Anti-Imperialist League

NOVEMBER 28, 1903

AND ITS ADJOURNMENT NOV. 30

PUBLISHED BY THE
NEW ENGLAND ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE
20 Central Street, Boston, Mass.

325.373
N44
v.5

REPORT

The fifth annual meeting of the New England Anti-Imperialist League was held on November 28, 1903, the last Saturday in November, at the office of the Secretary, at twelve o'clock noon, and was adjourned to the rooms of the Twentieth Century Club, 2 Ashburton Place, on Monday, November 30. After a lunch, the meeting was called to order by the Hon. Winslow Warren, who had been asked by the Executive Committee to preside, the reading of the records being dispensed with.

REMARKS BY THE HON. WINSLOW WARREN.

Finding myself unexpectedly in this position, which could be better filled by others, I congratulate you that the hostile criticism and abuse to which you have been subjected has not lessened your numbers nor abated your enthusiasm. The calling of hard names has but little effect upon those who battle for the liberty of a Nation and the principles which are the very foundation of our country. We have much to encourage us in the present outlook. Never since the agitation begun has there been so many people as now in the United States who are heartily sick of the Philippine venture and eager to get rid of the Islands and return to those principles which the country so hastily forsook. I am not disposed to criticise the motives which influence people. Doubtless many are disgusted because the venture does not and will not pay. Like the man in the comic song they exclaim, "For Heaven's sake, will someone take this elephant off my hands." But there are many who are troubled in their hearts at the false position of our country and at the cruelties and outrages which have naturally followed a wrong policy. Whatever may be the reasons, no one who has watched public opinion can fail to see an evident change of feeling over

p12985

the country and one which must give us hope for the future. It means a good deal when so shrewd a politician as Senator Proctor of Vermont openly expresses to a public gathering the view that the United States should have no possessions outside of the American continent, when Senators Allison and Spooner treat the question as still unsettled and hint at Philippine independence, when Massachusetts congressmen, who have thus far been guarded in their utterances, publicly join in the same conclusion, and when Ex-Secretary Long endeavors to make the people believe that President McKinley always looked forward to the independence of the Philippines. It may be as I suggested to the ex-secretary some time since, that ere long the Republican leaders will claim that they were always in favor of the independence of the Islands and that it would have been granted earlier if the Anti-Imperialists had not blocked the way!

The events of the past few weeks have given abundant food for thought to reflecting minds, and the ultimate end of our imperial strenuosity is becoming more and more apparent. The extraordinary course we are pursuing, the dangers of an aggressive foreign policy which disturb business and suggest those entangling alliances which Washington deprecated, throw new light upon our situation and are alarming a great many thoughtful people.

When I think of what has recently happened in Panama, opera bouffe which may yet end in tragedy, I am reminded of De Quincey's essay upon murder as a fine art, wherein he showed that he who begun as a mere murderer might ultimately degenerate into a liar; so we, having begun with murder and outrage in the Philippines, so soon have come to burglary and common stealing in Panama.

Whatever course others may take, ours for the future is plain; to insist as ever that the people of the Philippine Islands have just the same right to their freedom that we have, and that they alone should determine what form of government suits them. For us, as a Nation, it remains to right a public wrong. It may well be that having destroyed a promising new government there and subjected the people to the sway of force that we have increased our difficulties, but the American people can find a just and honorable way out if they really desire to right this wrong.

I have faith in our people, but at present our efforts should be directed toward holding out encouragement to the Filipinos,

to influencing our own people as far as may be, to sympathizing with and aiding all efforts to educate the Filipinos and fit them to better control themselves, and towards erecting and maintaining an orderly government, subject to the condition, however, that the people shall be educated only in those principles of freedom we here maintain and that the sound doctrines of the Declaration of Independence shall be instilled into their minds. We encourage no disorder there, but proper, peaceful organization and efforts to secure their independence we hope to see, trusting that our own people will realize that it is the right of the Filipinos and the duty of our Nation. But first of all the Filipinos should be encouraged by a declaration on our part that they shall have independence when they can show a capacity to erect a government which can and will keep order. A great difficulty will undoubtedly be, not the Christian people there, but the Moros and Sulus, and for them I see no outlet but to be left to their own devices, as they have been thus far and must be in any case unless we are to enter upon a war of extermination worse than our war upon the Indians. For such a war this Nation may be ready, but I question whether it will long submit to the expense and loss necessary for so unworthy an object.

But, my friends, it is not for me to occupy your time. I can only say that I look forward hopefully to the not distant time when the Republican party will come to the belief that the counsel of leaders like Harrison, and Edmunds, and Reed, and Sherman, and Hoar will be of more avail than that of Roosevelt, Beveridge and Lodge; and the Democratic party realize, as it does now in part, that there is a surer stay in the principles of their "grand old man" at Princeton, who retires from public life with greater respect and honor than that of any man save Lincoln since the early days of the Republic, and that therein lies a better prospect of success than in the vagaries of those who lead them to unutterable defeat. If such time shall come our cause will be safe in the hands of either political party and our work will be done.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.

Boston, Nov. 28, 1903.

The close of the fifth year of the activities of the New England Anti-Imperialist League brings us face to face with a

critical position. It is the duty of those whose stand is upon the watch tower to utter an urgent word of warning against any tendency to accept the situation as one in which these activities may be slackened in the least degree. This is the season that has been chosen by a United States senator, one of the leaders of the administration party, whose highly colored account of the conditions in Cuba had no slight influence in bringing on the war with Spain, to make an unqualified declaration in favor of a "continental republic." An ex-secretary of the navy, who was a trusted member of President McKinley's official family, has just asserted that Filipino independence was always the desire and hope of his chief. From the Philippines themselves reports are beginning to be heard that the Filipinos are acquiescing in the status quo and that they do not desire speedy independence. However exaggerated these reports may be, it was to be expected that the patronage, the opportunities for employment, the power and wealth of the United States government would have their influence upon many of those patriots whose resources have been destroyed as well as upon that element of the population which attaches itself inevitably to the existing order and which does not look beyond the present day's labor and wage.

While on the one hand there is a more or less established condition of peace, and on the other these comfortable assurances are put forth that the administration has the same end in view as that to which our labors have been directed, it may be asked; why should not the attitude of the Anti-Imperialists safely be one of expectancy, trusting that the end they have at heart may be brought about by the natural progress of events?

On the contrary, we believe that the moment is one for anxiety and for extraordinary exertions rather than for the least relaxation of vigilance or of effort. Very powerful forces are continually exerted to establish and to confirm an existing state of things, forces which work while men sleep. The building up of an extensive civil service, the establishment of industries, the investment of capital, create new responsibilities to foreigners and to our own citizens. The granting of franchises, the apportionment of lands, the erection of churches, schools and hospitals, the building of railroads, the conversion of forests into lumber, the cultivation of hemp and rubber and other natural products by the investment of American and European capital, are constantly rooting the alien control and making its overthrow more and more difficult. If the cry of the native for freedom is

stifled and his aspirations are satisfied with the vague expectations which are held out by the party in power, what wonder if these are liberally offered on every hand? When the claim of permanent domination was defiantly made there was something with which to fight, but when the difference between the imperialists and the anti-imperialists is asserted to be only a question of time, how great the temptation to lay down our arms and give up the battle, which, to quote one of our very sanguine adherents, "is already won!"

No matter what is talked of as a possibility of the remote future in the United States, no matter what the corrupting influences of the dominant race may have been in the Philippines, our demand must be made and made more vigorously than ever for an immediate, definite, official promise of entire independence for the Filipinos. When that is made it will be time enough to talk of conditions and of details. Until it is made the work of the Anti-Imperialist League must continue. There are many signs that if this last and most dangerous crisis can be met, this cause is in the way of winning popular favor. The exposure of the cruelties which attended the subjugation of the Philippines has done its work, and the enormous cost of the Philippine experiment—which, according to Mr. Edward Atkinson's computation, will be by the end of the year $920,000,000—has begun to be apprehended by the people.

The fundamental principles upon which the Anti-Imperialists have proceeded have been constitutional principles and have regarded neither party policies on the one hand nor the conditions in a foreign land on the other, but the safety, honor, and welfare of the Republic of the United States, which by its constitution made no provision for colonial possessions and makes no provision for dealing with an unassimilable people.

Disastrous effects upon our foreign and domestic policy are too obvious for enlargement. The Republic should be a bulwark against the imperializing tendencies which are threatening the progress of the Anglo-Saxon race, whereas in the recent exploit of Panama we have shown ourselves past masters in the art of territorial bucaneering. Perhaps, insignificant as it may seem, this event in its high-handed presumption and its inevitable consequences may be the means of awakening the American people from the intoxication which has so long possessed it and of leading it back to the ways of sanity, peace and humanity.

Historical Events.

The past year has been fruitful in bringing forth historical demonstrations of the events preceding and following the war with Spain which have established the justice of the Anti-Imperialist contention. The diplomatic correspondence with Spain makes it perfectly clear that all those reforms which were urged by the United States were to have been carried out and that the most sacred pledges had been given for their prompt fulfilment. The Spanish minister had secured the intervention of Leo XIII. to establish a holy truce and thus satisfy the pride of the Spanish nation while the details were being settled with Cuba and the United States. The Revue Historique for July-August last brings out facts not hitherto disclosed in the official publications of our own government, and confirms our knowledge of the President's responsibility for concealing from Congress the actual condition of the diplomatic intercourse and for his surrender to the madness of the hour.

A publication has been made of the evidence of Consul General Fitzhugh Lee confirming the official dispatches in which he entreated that the Maine be not sent to Havana because it would obstruct autonomy, produce excitement and most probably cause a demonstration. As a matter of fact, the Maine was immediately ordered to proceed to Havana, while Mr. McKinley, in his message of March 28, 1898, stated that the announcement of the intention of the visit of the Maine was received with "appreciation of its friendly character."

Affidavits are in hand by wreckers and divers employed on the sunken hulk of the Maine which apparently prove that there was no mine or external explosion.

The evidences of the concealment and deception in regard to the practices of the army in the Philippines are a matter of record and it is not necessary for a change of administration which will open the archives of the war department to inform the people of the United States of the methods pursued to keep out the light by its servants there.

The recent census in the Philippines has established two points: The comparatively insignificant number of those wild tribes, the "Apaches" of President Roosevelt, who would have produced in the Islands a welter of blood on the withdrawal of the American forces, and the fact that the Filipinos were practically a Christian nation, there being 7,000,000 civilized Fili-

pinos,—meaning those who have been baptised in the Catholic church,—and but 650,000 wild or barbarous Filipinos scattered through the various islands. Our census takers found no better means of prosecuting their work than to employ the very careful and trustworthy enumeration of the Roman church. To get the entire population it would be necessary to add the number of foreigners, Japanese and Chinese. The million and a half Filipinos who have died by act of war or in consequence of war bring up the number close to that of the original estimate.

Work of the League.

The work of the Anti-Imperialist League has been directed as before to the dissemination of intelligence by documents, public meetings and correspondence, co-operating wherever the opportunity offered with the party which in its platforms and the professions of its candidates has maintained the Anti-Imperialist cause. We have been consulted in reference to some of these platforms and have been even requested to draw up Anti-Imperialist planks which should be satisfactory to ourselves. In this connection it is interesting to note how frankly Anti-Imperialists in the North, even those who have been identified with the Anti-slavery movement and who look with disfavor upon the present attitude of some southern Democrats toward their colored fellow-citizens, may co-operate with them in the cause which we have at heart. The Hon. John S. Williams of Mississippi, who has been chosen to be the Democratic leader in the national House of Representatives, has recently written as follows: "I cannot sufficiently express my horror of the absolute temerity with which this government has annexed another and a stupendous race problem. . . . . It does seem curious, incredible, if the facts were not before our very eyes, that we should take on another unassimilable and necessarily unsympathetic inferior race."

Documents.

Among our most valuable documents has been the little leaflet to teachers offering to supply materials for the debates which are constantly taking place in colleges and schools upon the Philippine question. This was circulated among the 15,000 visiting teachers at the Educational Convention last summer and sent to the members of the association at their home addresses, and has led to many inquiries and has given us the opportunity to send out many hundreds of packages of our pamphlets, leaflets

and broadsides. We still have on hand many of the publications of previous years which have a standard quality and we have distributed these along with our newer issues. A list is appended of the new publications and documents handled by the office during the last year:

Report of the Fourth Annual Meeting N. E. A. I. League, Nov. 29, 1902.

Address, the Hon. George S. Boutwell, Faneuil Hall, Jan. 1, 1903, Celebration 40th Anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation by the colored people of Boston and vicinity.

Annual Address, the Hon. Moorfield Story, Columbia, Jan. 16, 1903, before the Bar Association of South Carolina.

Speeches, the Hon. Redfield Proctor and the Hon. J. H. Berry, U. S. Senate, Jan. 28 and Feb. 2, 1903, The Conduct of Capt. Brownell Charged with the Torture of the Priest Augustine.

Speech, the Hon. E. W. Carmack, U. S. Senate, Feb. 9, 1903, Courts Martial in the Philippines.

Protest, the Hon. E. W. Carmack, U. S. Senate, March 2, 1903, Suppression of the Truth.

Commonwealth or Empire, Dr. Goldwin Smith.

Contact of Higher and Lower Races, Alexander F. Chamberlain.

Report of Mass Meetings of Protest Against the Suppression of Truth about the Philippines, Faneuil Hall, March 19, 1903.

Address by the Rev. Charles Gordon Ames at a Mass Meeting of Protest, Faneuil Hall, March 19, Let There Be Light.

Circular suggesting membership and annual subscriptions, June 4, 1903.

Circular to teachers offering to supply documents as material for debaters on the Philippine Question.

Address, Col. Daniel Hall, Opera House, Dover, N. H., May 30, 1903, A Protest Against Expansion.

Address, the Hon. S. W. McCall, Tufts College, June 16, 1903, Delta Chapter of Massachusetts Phi Beta Kappa, The Scholar in Politics a Conservative.

Address, Edwin D. Mead, Faneuil Hall, July 4, 1903, Principles of the Founders.

Address, the Hon. Charles A. Towne, New York, July 4, 1903, The Continental Republic.

Independence of the Philippines Urged by Overwhelming American Sentiment, Leaflet.

Cost of War and Warfare Extended by estimate to Dec. 31, 1903, Edward Atkinson.

The Cost of Criminal Aggression in the Philippine Islands to the People of Massachusetts. Edward Atkinson.

Diplomatic Correspondence with Spain (to be printed).

Census Report of the Number of Barbarous and Wild Tribes in the Philippines (to be printed).

The whole number of documents circulated exceeds 150,000.

Meetings.

We have had three meetings during the year:—

A luncheon, which was conducted by ladies at the Hotel Bellevue, May 13th. Mrs. Charles Gordon Ames presided and addresses were made by Mrs. Edwin D. Mead, Senorita Clemencia Lopez, Miss Maria L. Baldwin, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell and Mr. John A. Hobson.

March 19th, 1903, two mass meetings of protest, afternoon and evening, were held in Faneuil Hall "Against the Suppression of Truth in the Philippines." The Hon. Moorfield Storey presided and addresses were made by the Hon. George S. Boutwell, Col. T. W. Higginson, the Hon. Charles S. Hamlin, Mr. Herbert Welsh, the Hon. Winslow Warren, the Rev. Charles G. Ames, Lieut. John F. Hall, Col. Charles R. Codman, Rev. Charles F. Dole and Mr. Thomas T. Patterson and the testimony of some of the witnesses who were refused a hearing before the Senate Committee was heard.

October 5th, 1903, a farewell luncheon was given to Senorita Lopez at the Twentieth Century Club. Mr. Frank B. Sanborn presided and speeches were made by Mr. William Lloyd Garrison, the Hon. George S. Boutwell, Prof. Katharine A. Coman of Wellesley, the Rev. Wm. R. Lord, Senorita Clemencia Lopez, Mrs. Charles Gordon Ames, Mrs. Abby Morton Diaz, Senor Sixto Lopez and Senor Jose Katikbak.

October 22d an offer was made to the Republican State Committee to supply speakers for a joint debate in Faneuil Hall on the subject of the policy of the Republican Administration in subjugating and retaining the Philippine Islands, as this question had been made an issue of the present campaign by the excellent declaration of the Democratic platform. This offer was declined by the Republican State Committee in a letter from the chairman which stated that the committee "is not a believer in the policy of joint debate, especially at this late stage of the campaign."

A conference of representative Anti-Imperialists, attended

by delegates from many states, was recently called at the initiation of the League and met in New York. A national committee was appointed to conduct the Anti-Imperialists' affairs, especially with reference to the coming political campaign.

Correspondence.

It may be well to quote from a few letters recently received in the course of the office correspondence.

The Hon. John G. Carlisle wrote a few days ago: "I have not changed my opinions in the least."

President J. G. Schurman reiterates his opinion: "From the beginning, however, I have always hoped and proclaimed that our mission in the Philippines was to prepare the Filipinos for self-government and eventual independence. That policy I have consistently advocated and that, I suppose, is the future policy of the Anti-Imperialist League."

Mr. Bolton Hall writes: "I am in hearty sympathy with the work and consider it a pressing one."

Prof. H. Parker Willis of Washington & Lee University, Lexington, Ky., writes: "Your organization has my very best wishes and I sincerely hope it may continue its work with an active campaign wherein the regular supply of authoritative information concerning the Philippine conditions will play a large part."

Dr. Lippincott of Philadelphia writes: "My sympathies are wholly with this movement and I do not hesitate to let my feelings be known."

Ex-Senator Pettigrew: "I am with you most earnestly in opposition to the colonial policy of the government. I wish I had more time to give to this cause and I hope to have more time next year. I am trying to arrange my business so as to be foot-loose to devote a great deal of my time to this public question in which I am most deeply interested."

Mr. Russell Sturgis of New York, in allusion to certain lukewarm conduct of some Anti-Imperialists writes: "I cannot think that the policy of self-effacement, anonymity and what seems to me timid shrinking from criticism is going to advance the Anti-Imperialist cause. . . . . Could I give money by the thousand dollars at a time I should try to make conditions and to say that no society deserved to live that was so afraid to confess its own existence."

Ex-Congressman Lentz: "I am more of an Anti-Imperial-

ist now than I was when I met you last. It must be apparent to every reader of history and every student of the philosophy of history that the conscience of the American people is becoming more and more callous. Nothing counts except commercialism. Everything tends toward materialism and pessimism. A nation with no high moral purpose is an awful sight, and I am deeply interested in the good work you and your associates are doing."

The Hon. Horace Boies of Iowa: "I should have been glad to express in some way my sympathy in your effort to keep alive in the American heart a reasonable sense of justice to others . . . . . and beg to assure you of my heartfelt gratitude to you and your society for the noble work in which you are engaged."

Bishop Huntington writes: "My confidence in the principles of the League and my sense of the need of their constant and determined proclamation are without abatement. The perilous delusion which is subtly sweeping the American mind and conscience away from the original aims and convictions of the Republic is strange and can probably be accounted for only by the dangerous prosperity and tempting materialism of the Americans."

The Hon. Louis R. Ehrich: "Nearly three years ago, when Secretary Hay announced to the New York Chamber of Commerce that the basis of our foreign policy was 'the Monroe doctrine and the Golden Rule,' he was cheered to the echo. In the same speech, however, he spoke of the Philippines as 'a responsibility which Providence imposed upon us.' This seemed to me disquieting because it implied that American diplomacy, a la Hay, was based on the Monroe doctrine, the Golden Rule, plus our own interpretation of God's intentions. Our late performance in South America evidently amends the Golden Rule to mean that we must do to weak nations what they would possibly do to us if they were as strong and unscrupulous as we are. Mark the contrast: The millions of the Philippine people, after years of struggle for independence, after the adoption of a model constitution, and after having governed themselves in peace for six months, were denied recognition by our government. The mongrel handful of Panama insurgents, after a paper revolution, and without the slightest semblance of organized government, were recognized within six days. The disheartening fact is that the connivance of our administration in the dismemberment of a sister republic is accepted so phlegmatically. The country ought

to be ringing with the protests of citizens in mass-meetings assembled. A few brave editors' are the only voices heard in opposition. Does not this indicate a moral decadence of the American people and a loss of that former 'chastity of honor which felt a stain like a wound'? The mission of the Anti-Imperialists is not only that of urging our country to do justice to other nations, but the more important work of reviving those sentiments of liberty and of national righteousness which will make 'criminal aggression' impossible and ensure the preservation of our historic ideals. There should be no faltering in our ranks. We must appeal again and again and again to 'the better angels' of the American people, in the hope that our voices may penetrate their selfish materialism and rekindle that love of justice and of right which should be the jealous pride of every noble republic."

The Rev. A. A. Berle: "I write now, however, to assure you of my steadfast adherance to the cause in which we are both interested and to say that in my judgment there has been no greater occasion for this organization than now. We may have patiently to carry on the work of instruction as it is being done to the edification of many and their enlightment also. It is possible that we shall not achieve all that we hope to achieve now, but the future is surely ours. Of this I have no doubt. The steady output of the literature of protest will at length bring the thoughtful people of the nation to a realizing sense of what has happened and what is happening, and will tend, when the reaction comes, to stiffen up the methods of procedure by enactments which will make it vastly more difficult in the future to depart from the primitive standards than it has been. For our purposes, there could be no greater living illustration of the follies and violations of international good will and honorable dealing than that which we are now seeing at Washington. Executive actions are preaching our doctrines far more effectively than we can preach them with our words. Command me whenever I can render aid to the cause. It would have been a great pleasure to me to meet the leaders again at the annual mteting, but the exigency forbade."

Obituary.

We have lost two good friends during the year,—Dr. Francis Ellingwood Abbott and Mr. Nathaniel T. Allen. Mr. Allen had been a constant and generous contributor to the Anti-Im-

perialist cause. In a letter writen by him only a fortnight before his death he wrote that "as an old and true Garrisonian Abolitionist and a Republican of the Charles Sumner school" he hoped "ere long it may be easy to aid financially in the good work," and added, "In other ways I have and do use my influence with the very many former students of mine in this and other states." Dr. Abbot was a passionate Anti-Imperialist and he gave to our cause a most intense devotion. We shall miss the pure and ardent spirit which glowed with so clear and intense a light.

ERVING WINSLOW, Secretary.

THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE in account with DAVID G. HASKINS, JR., TREASURER.

Dr.		*Cr.*	
To amounts expended from Nov. 30, 1902, to Nov. 29, 1903, inclusive, viz.:		By balance on hand Nov. 30, 1902	314.20
For postage, express, messengers	$1933.09	" contributions in response to appeal of Dec. 13, 1902, 78 in number	1680.50
" typewriting, use of typewriter, copying, etc.	928.09	" other contributions, 45 in number	1678.03
" printing, etc.	578.62	" membership fees and annual dues	612.50
" expenses of meetings and travelling	126.00	" interest, New England Trust Co.	3.18
" addressing and forwarding literature	112.34		
" translating, Congressional Information Bureau	29.05		
" stationery, telegraph and sundries	379.89		
" balance on hand, Nov. 30, 1903.	201.33		
	$4288.41		$4,288.41

E. and O. E

DAVID G. HASKINS, JR., *Treasurer.*

Nov. 30, 1903.

Boston, Nov. 27, 1903.

I hereby certify that I have examined the accounts of David G. Haskins, Jr., as treasurer of the New England Anti-Imperialist League, for the year ending November 24th, 1903; that I have found them properly vouched and correctly cast, and that his cash balance on hand is $201.33.

FRANCIS A. OSBORN, *Auditor.*

The Treasurer does not feel that he would be doing his full duty by merely submitting this array of figures without attempting, even though inadequately, to express the gratitude of the Executive Committee for the enthusiastic and unfaltering support given to the work during this, the fifth, year of the League's existence; and their high appreciation of the patriotism and devotion of the many men and women who, caring nothing for public recognition, have contributed according to their means, again and again, year after year, for the preservation of American ideals.

We face, today, a new year; and one of exceptional importance. The presidential election will absorb public attention and, in large measure, will fix the policy of the country for four years. Imperialism will be one of the great issues in the contest. The thoughtful student of American politics can hardly fail to recognize the rapid growth of this dangerous disease in influential quarters. The criminal blunder in the Philippines is bearing its natural fruit, in a more lordly and overbearing attitude towards our weaker neighbors in this hemisphere. Events passing before our eyes this present month show it. The administration has approved and aided, if it has not instigated, a revolt in Panama against a friendly power. It has forcibly prevented that power from attempting to suppress the revolt; and with indecent haste has signed a treaty for the coveted canal with the agent of an irresponsible revolutionary committee. The press, with some honorable exceptions, seems to approve the policy and stimulates the spirit of lawless arrogance. A leading New England newspaper of high standing, within a few days, has gone so far as to intimate that what it terms "the petty South American oligarchies that masquerade as republics" may "provoke us at last to rouse ourselves and stamp out their miserable existence"; adding, "The world will be a better place to live in, if and when the United States takes over the control of the island of Hayti, and of Central America, and of Colombia, and of Venezuela, and of every other petty state whose inhabitants, after nearly a hundred years of trial, have proved incapable of governing themselves, or contributing in any way to the welfare of mankind!" And even within two days, it has been intimated from Washington that the United States may send ships and troops, if necessary, to Venezuela, to compel her to pay her European debts.

To what is all this tending? The drift is alarming; and,

if not checked, no one can tell, as our navy increases and our taste for conquest grows, whither, in the name and supposed interest of commerce and civilization, it may sweep the country.

What can be done to check this tendency and to rouse the American people to a sense of their danger? To attempt this is the great work set before the Anti-Imperialist Leagues,—the work which we must do to the utmost of our strength and ability. The work of education must be carried on more vigorously, on a larger scale than ever. Branches of the League should be established wherever practicable in the large cities as centres of distribution. Literature should be provided and circulated broadcast. Public meetings should be held during the campaign. Parties and candidates advocating Philippine independence and opposing aggression in this hemisphere should be warmly supported. In particular, the distribution of documents to teachers, which has already been begun with such success and promise, should be actively continued as an important means of influencing the rising generation. And lastly money is needed,—not a paltry four thousand dollars, but ten times four thousand dollars,—to carry on the work as it should be done. The Executive Committee are ready and anxious to prosecute it with all their might. But they are beginning this important year with only a little over $200.00 in the treasury. The Treasurer and the Committee know well that every appeal has been cheerfully and generously responded to by the noble men and women who have supported the cause through all these years, and that their assistance will not fail in the future. But they are too few to bear all the burden of such a great national work. It is of great importance that our membership be increased. There are, no doubt, thousands of people in this country opposed to the un-American policy of imperialism who have never yet given a dollar to oppose it. Many of these people would contribute if the case were properly presented to them. How can they be reached? This is the great question. The Committee do not know them and cannot find them. Will not every member of the League who may hear or read this appeal; and every friend of the cause,—the cause so vitally important to America as well as to the Philippines,—help it at this crisis and make a resolution to secure at least one new subscriber in the new year? Will they not also send to the Secretary lists of persons who are likely to be interested and to whom appeals and documents can be sent?

The contest may be long and the work of education may be

slow, but we shall win. For we must never for a moment lose our faith in the good heart and honest purpose of the majority of the American people. Often misled, they mean to do right. Their very imperialism is justified in their eyes by the specious idea that America is a "trustee for civilization," and that her encroachments and conquests somehow make for righteousness and have the Divine approval. They need to be convinced, not denounced; they need arguments and clear statements of fact; not emotional appeals. This is the work of the League. Avoiding all bitterness and intemperance of speech, recognizing that our opponents are largely actuated by good motives, we must seek to convince them of their great error. And sooner or later, in spite of inadequate numbers and limited means, the great cause will triumph; the American people will see the right and do it; and the ideals of the Declaration of Independence will prevail.

"For right is right, since God is God,
And right the day shall win;
To doubt would be disloyalty,
To falter would be sin."

DAVID G. HASKINS, JR., Treasurer.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

On motion, a committee consisting of Mr. Francis J. Garrison and Mr. Walter C. Wright was appointed by the chair to collect and count ballots for officers for the ensuing year, and having performed this duty, reported that the following gentlemen were unanimously elected:

President,

George S. Boutwell.

Vice-Presidents,

Charles G. Ames,
Edward Atkinson,
Leonard W. Bacon,
Samuel Bowles
Gamaliel Bradford,
D. H. Chamberlain,
A. P. Childs,
Charles R. Codman,
Patrick A. Collins,
C. F. Dole,
E. Winchester Donald,
Dana Estes,
William Lloyd Garrison,
Edwin Ginn,
Seth C. Gordon,
Arthur C. A. Hall,
Thomas Wentworth Higginson,
Henry F. Hollis,
Henry W. Lamb,
Luther F. McKinney,
George E. McNeill,
Edwin D. Mead,
Henry B. Metcalf,
Robert M. Morse,
James P. Munroe,
Charles Eliot Norton,
Francis A. Osborn,
Robert Treat Paine, Jr.,
Albion A. Perry,
Henry Pickering,
Edwin C. Pierce,
A. A. Putnam,
Josiah Quincy, Jr.,
Frank B. Sanborn,
W. H. Scott,
Moorfield Storey,
William G. Sumner,
Charles F. Thayer,
Winslow Warren.

Executive Committee.

Albert S. Parsons,
Charles Fleischer,
John Ritchie,
Julian Codman,
Archibald M. Howe,
Charles Warren.
Fiske Warren.

Treasurer,

David Greene Haskins, Jr.

Secretary,

Erving Winslow.

ADDRESS BY PROF. WILLIAM JAMES.

Mr. Chairman: I think we have candidly to admit that in the matter of our Philippine conquest we here and our friends outside have failed to produce much immediate effect. 'Duty and Destiny' have rolled over us like a Juggernaut car whose unwieldy bulk the majority of our countrymen were pushing and pulling forward, and our outcries and attempts to scotch the wheels with our persons haven't acted in the least degree as a brake. Nevertheless, if we look round us today we see a great change from the conditions that prevailed when the outbreak of hostilities first called us into being. Religious emotion and martial hysterics are both over with the public, and the sober fit is on.

In the physiologies which I studied when I was young, the function of incorporating foreign bodies into one's organism was divided into four stages—prehension, deglutition, digestion and assimilation. We prehended our prey, or took it into our mouth, when President McKinley posted his annexation edict, and insalivated with pious phrases the alternative he offered to our late allies of instant obedience or death. The morsel thus lubricated, deglutition went on slowly during those three years and more when our army was slaughtering and burning, and famine, fire, disease and depopulation were the new allies we invoked. But if the swallowing took three years, how long ought the process of digestion, that teaching of the Filipinos to be 'fit' for rule, that solution of recalcitrant lumps into a smooth 'chyle,' with which our civil commission is charged—how long ought that to take? It will take a decade, at least. As for assimilation, that is altogether an affair of the day after tomorrow. The most sanguine expect no real assimilation of our prey to us or of us to our prey for fifty years to come, and no one who knows history expects that it can genuinely come at all.

Meanwhile, in spite of the indifference of the newspapers and in spite of the administrative barring out of news, our public has actually grown a little educated and reflective since the war began. It is fair to say that the more idealistic of our expansionists have put this forward from the outset as one chief reason why the Islands should be annexed. We were remaining too provincial-minded, they said, here in the United States, and this new responsibility would cultivate our consciousness of international affairs. But the consciousness which the experience has

cultivated is a consciousness that all the anti-imperialistic prophecies were right. One by one we have seen them punctually fulfilled:—The material ruin of the Islands; the transformation of native friendliness to execration; the demoralization of our army, from the war office down—forgery decorated, torture whitewashed, massacre condoned; the creation of a chronic anarchy in the Islands, with ladronism still smouldering, and the lives of American travelers and American sympathizers unsafe in the country out of sight of army posts; the deliberate reinflaming on our part of ancient tribal animosities, the arming of Igorrote savages and Macabebe semi-savages, too low to have a national consciousness, to help us hunt the highest portions of the population down; the inoculation of Manila with a floating Yankee scum; these things, I say, or things like them, were things which everyone with any breadth of understanding clearly foretold; while the incapacity of our public for taking the slightest interest in anything so far away was from the outset a foregone conclusion.

It is only fair to President McKinley and his coadjutors and successor to say that their better angels also had a finger in the pie, and that the institution of our civil commission has gone far toward redeeming our national reputation for good sense. The only trouble is that this agency has come too late for any solid success. We are trying to do with our right hand what with our left hand, the army, we had made impossible in advance. When we landed at Manila we found a passionate native cordiality, which would have met us half way in almost any scheme of protectorate and co-operation which we might have proposed. But, 'like the base Indian,' we threw that pearl of a psychological moment away, and embarked, callous and cold, and business-like, as we flattered ourselves, upon our sinister plan of a preliminary military deglutition of them, just to show them what 'Old Glory' meant. Let our civil commission do what it will now, the hands will not move backward on the dial, the day of genuine co-operation with the Filipinos is forever past. We cannot even be certain that the well-meaning commission will be anything but what the army thinks it, a sop to sentimentalists at home, and in the Islands a safe cover for the treacherous natives to hatch a new rebellion out.

This, then, is where we are today. The first act is over, and what is done can't be undone. Difficult as it is to keep hot words of accusation from rising to our lips whenever we think of

the men who threw away so splendid an American opportunity —threw it away with our own action in the Cuba case before us as the only precedent we had to follow,—nevertheless it is bad politics to dwell too long upon events of yesterday. We opponents of an imperialist policy must simply hand over our brief for the past to the historians' keeping,—the historians who are already at work upon the chronicle, and who will shape the verdict of posterity upon the whole affair. We have made their labors easier. Time will unwind yet many a secret, but our Secretary and his fellow-workers have let few facts now attainable escape their channels of publicity, and for that service to truth they deserve our heartiest thanks.

Let us drop yesterday and its sins, then, and forget them. The attitude of 'I told you so' is sterile, and wise men know when to change their tune. To the ordinary citizen the word anti-imperialist suggests a thin-haired being just waked up from the day before yesterday, brandishing the Declaration of Independence excitedly, and shrieking after a railroad train thundering toward its destination to turn upon its tracks and come back. Anti-imperialism, people think, is something petrified, a religion, a thing that results in martyrdom, for which to 'discuss' means only to prophesy and denounce. If, so far, some of us have struck a slightly monotonous attitude, we have our good excuse. The wounds which our love of country received in those days of February, 1899, are of a kind that do not quickly heal. They ache too persistently to allow us easily to forget. Forget we must, however, we must attend to the practical possibilities of today.

And what are they? Immediate scuttling is certainly not among them, and anyone who should now urge it would, speaking practically, be a fool. Nations are masses with too enormous a momentum to reverse their motion with a jerk. They must be brought round in a curve. It seems even doubtful whether it would be for the Islands' interest to have our government immediately withdraw. What they need now is quiet for a few years, time to repair war's ravages, and to acquire some habits of administration which might outlast our stay. Not today, then, but tomorrow, is what we ought to work for—abandonment of the islands as soon as, in our delicious phraseology, we have made them 'fit,' and meanwhile as steady a pressure as we can bring to bear towards determining our people to face that prospect, and towards making Congress say the decisive word.

The Democrats have already espoused our principles, and many of us think, therefore, that the one thing left for us is to espouse the Democratic cause. Against this there is the objection that the Democrats are only half sincere in the matter— it is largely an opposition issue to gain the independent vote—and there is the still stronger objection that the Republicans themselves have not half made up their minds that the Islands ought to be retained. The better self of the Republicans, their subliminal consciousness, so to speak, is already on our side. The party was railroaded into its conquistadore career by the McKinley administration. The war short-circuited political reflection, and we had first of all to back up the Flag. But we may be sure that today the state of mind, even of our leaders, is full of misgivings, and that if we don't put them too much on the defensive, time will do our work.

The vital fact of the situation for us is that neither presidents nor Congress have as yet dared to face the responsibility of making any permanent colonial professions to which in pride or consistency we might find ourselves obliged to live up. Our adventure has literally been a wayward spree of power, wholly detached from any definite policy or plan. The instinct for self-preservation which in this has ruled us, is wiser far than a greater sense for national dignity would have been. The policy of drift has never been abandoned. If we should grant the Islands independence tomorrow, no man could show a scrap of paper to prove that we had broken a pledge to anybody, or had backed out of a single clause in our program.

Our tactics in this situation, Mr. Chairman, would therefore seem to be the simplest in the world. We must individually do all we can to circulate two phrases, so that the public ear becomes inured—"Independence for the Philippine Islands," and "Treat the Filipinos like the Cubans," and we must do all we can to force the hands of both parties to a positive declaration before its next presidential campaign. The Republicans will certainly not make a declaration for perpetual retention, and every open shying from that issue helps public opinion the other way. Constant dropping wears the marble. Phrases repeated have a way of turning into facts.

I hope you have not all forgotten the great speech on 'Public Opinion' which Wendell Phillips made in 1852. Read it again, anyhow, for it is full of inspiration for us here. "Hearts and sentiments are alive," said Phillips, "and we know that the

gentlest of Nature's growths or motions will in time burst asunder or wear away the proudest dead-weight man can put upon them. You may build your capitol of granite, and pile it as high as the Rocky Mountains, but if it is founded on or mixed up with iniquity, the pulse of a girl will in time beat it down. . . . . This heart of mine, which beats so uninterruptedly in the bosom, if its force could be directed against a granite pillar, would wear it to dust in the course of a man's life. Your capitol, Daniel Webster," continued Phillips—if he had been speaking here he would have used other names—"Your capitol is marble, but the pulse of every humane man is beating against it. God will give us time and the pulses of men shall beat it down. The day must be ours, thank God, for the hearts, the hearts, are on our side."

Phillips's era saw the heart of man in perhaps a little simpler light than we can. We used to believe then that we were of a different clay from other nations, that there was something deep in the American heart that answered to our happy birth, free from that hereditary burden which the nations of Europe bear, and which obliges them to grow by preying on their neighbors. Idle dream! pure Fourth of July fancy, scattered in five minutes by the first temptation. In every national soul there lie potentialities of the most barefaced piracy, and our own American soul is no exception to the rule. Angelic impulses and predatory lusts divide our heart exactly as they divide the hearts of other countries. It is good to rid ourselves of cant and humbug, and to know the truth about ourselves. Political virtue does not follow geographical divisions. It follows the eternal division inside of each country between the more animal and the more intellectual kind of men, between the tory and the liberal tendencies, the jingoism and animal instinct that would run things by main force and brute possession, and the critical conscience that believes in educational methods and in rational rules of right.

As a group of citizens calling to our country to return to the principles which it was suckled in, I believe that we Anti-Imperialists are already a back number. We had better not print that name upon our publications any longer. The country has once for all regurgitated the Declaration of Independence and the Farewell Address, and it won't swallow again immediately what it is so happy to have vomited up. It has come to a hiatus. It has deliberately pushed itself into the circle of international

hatreds, and joined the common pack of wolves. It relishes the attitude. We have thrown off our swaddling clothes, it thinks, and attained our majority. We are objects of fear to other lands. This makes of the old liberalism and the new liberalism of our country two discontinuous things. The older liberalism was in office, the new is in the opposition. Inwardly it is the same spirit, but outwardly the tactics, the questions, the reasons, and the phrases have to change. American memories no longer serve as catchwords. The great international and cosmopolitan liberal party, the party of conscience and intelligence the world over, has, in short, absorbed us; and we are only its American section, carrying on the war against the powers of darkness here, playing our part in the long, long campaign for truth and fair dealing which must go on in all the countries of the world until the end of time. Let us cheerfully settle into our interminable task. Everywhere it is the same struggle under various names, —light against darkness, right against might, love against hate. The Lord of life is with us, and we cannot permanently fail.

REMARKS BY THE HON. GEORGE S. BOUTWELL.

It is now two years since I expressed the opinion in public that the abandonment of the Philippine Islands and the policy of Empire introduced by President McKinley could be accomplished only by and through the overthrow of the Republican party.

That is my opinion today. If my remarks can have any value that value will be due to the criticism I am to make upon the financial policy of the administration.

It is my purpose to find, to name and to trace the public policies by which it has become possible for business organizations to obtain control of industries essential to the public prosperity and to administer such industries to the injury of the business of the country. One of these policies, the protective system, has been named and much discussed. In my view, whatever may be true in regard to the protective system, it cannot be held responsible for the creation of those monopolies, but only as a contributor to their support when their creation had become possible. It is apparent that the protective system, however advantageous it may be to particular industries in a given period of time, cannot upon the moment furnish the capital by which

an organization of $10,000,000 or $100,000,000 can be created and set in motion.

In order that the evil which I am to set forth may be appreciated in its fulness, I shall bring into view the events that occurred in a period only not so remote as to be beyond the memory of men still living.

In the year 1828 the contest between the friends of Gen. Jackson, who were known as "Jackson men," and the friends of John Quincy Adams was more severe than any contest which had occurred at any previous election in the history of the country. It was a grave charge against Mr. Adams's administration that the expenses had exceeded $13,000,000 a year. When within the last twelve months this statement, as a recollection of my youth, came before my mind, I doubted the accuracy of my memory. Upon a reference to the records of the treasury department, I found that in the administration of Mr. Adams from 1825 to 1829 the total expenses of the government had never risen to the sum of $14,000,000 for any one year. Under the tariff acts, which were protective in some degree, of 1816 and 1824, the revenues of the country had far exceeded the expenses, and finally reached a point when Gen. Jackson's administration was able to pay the entire public debt by a purchase of bonds at a rate far above their par value, to distribute large sums of money to states according to their representative power in the government, and to find a large balance to the credit of the government in the bank of the United States.

During the first four years of Gen. Jackson's administration the question of the re-charter of the Bank of the United States came before the country. The majority in Congress favored the re-charter of the bank, but the bill that was passed was vetoed by Gen. Jackson. Thus was the issue raised before the country.

In the year 1791 or 1792 the revenues of the country had been deposited in the Bank of the United States, and through it and its branches the payment of the public debt and public expenses was made. Gen. Jackson resolved to remove the public funds from the Bank of the United States, and as there was no second policy possible, they were deposited in state banks.

Simultaneously with the announcement of this policy, on the part of the administration, there was devoleped through the North, and especially in New England, a tendency to invest money in wild lands in the state of Maine and in unoccu-

pied lands on the western frontier. The pet banks, or banks in which these deposits had been made, finding that they had money to be used advantageously through loans, gave accommodation to persons who made investments in lands and to others who were entering upon what in those days were large undertakings.

These incidents were followed by an act of Congress, under the lead of Mr. Clay, which was productive of disastrous consequences. The revenues had been large in proportion to the public expenses. In 1833 the customs revenue was $29,000,000 plus, and in 1834 it had fallen to $16,250,000. In 1843 the customs revenue was a trifle over $7,000.000. Under the influence of these disturbing events, the revenues were about $34,000,000, and the exependitures were about $14,000,000. The charge was fostered that the manufacturers were realizing large profits from the protective system, and a demand was made for a reduction of duties. This demand was answered by a compromise proposition which was accepted. It was provided by an act that was passed in the year 1832, under the lead of Mr. Clay, that the duties on goods imported should be reduced horizontally, and the remaining duty, whatever it was, should be reduced each year for five years.

Under the influence of this act manufacturers produced only what could be sold without delay; the merchants and dealers of all grades purchased from day to day what could be disposed of by the same process. The prostration of industry followed this statute and the laboring classes were brought to a situation which cannot now be realized. The reduction of the revenues of the country through the failure of importations forced the government to call upon the banks for a return of the money that had been deposited with them. The banks in their turn called upon the persons to whom they had made loans and the result was the failure of the pet banks that had already become the objects of jealousy and hostility.

This condition of things was followed by the defeat of Mr. Van Buren in 1840, when only five states were left as the result of the administrations of Gen. Jackson and Mr. Van Buren, which in other respects had been satisfactory to the country.

When the Democrats returned to power on the election of 1844 they inaugurated the one measure of public policy which has continued to this day, and which, after its adoption

and trial, had met with general approval or it had been tolerated or accepted without criticism until within the last ten years. I speak of the independent treasury system, as it was termed in the statute and known to its friends, or the subtreasury system as it was characterized by its opponents at the time of the passage of the act. Under that system the funds of the United States were to be deposited in the independent treasury, the headquarters being at Washington, with assistant treasuries in the cities and business points of the country. Thus the public funds were placed in the hands of public officers, held for public uses only and beyond the reach of money borrowers. They were withdrawn entirely from business use.

Beyond these facilities for administering the affairs of the government it became necessary from time to time that deposits should be made in local banks for the purpose of enabling agents and officers to meet expenditures and liabilities that might be incurred in particular localities. These expenditures arose from the erection of public buildings or the improvement of a harbor or a river. The deposits in national banks in the first term of Gen. Grant's administration may be read in the letter of the treasurer of the United States as follows:

Office of the Treasurer of the United States,

Washington, D. C., Oct. 16, 1903.

The Hon. George S. Boutwell, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass:

Dear Sir.—In reply to your letter of Oct. 10, 1903, relative to public money on deposit with national banks while you were at the head of this department, you are advised that the amount in national banks to the credit of the treasurer of the United States at the end of each quarter during the period named was as follows, viz.:

Quarter ended.	Amount.
March 31, 1869	9,772,155.41
June 30, 1869	8,875,296.79
Sept. 30, 1869	7,570,739.43
Dec. 31, 1869	7,253,822.88
March 31, 1870	7,786,465.36
June 30, 1870	8,483,549.79
Sept. 30, 1870	6,948,893.58
Dec. 31, 1870	6,584,991.27

March 31, 1871	6,015,517.61
June 30, 1871	7,197,015.04
Sept. 30, 1871	6,827,706.82
Dec. 31, 1871	7,183,672.16
March 31, 1872	34,837,005.61
June 30, 1872	12,663,714.53
Sept. 30, 1872	7,076,244.74
Dec. 31, 1872	8,172,910.40
March 31, 1873	7,233,356.26

J. F. Meline, Assistant Treasurer, United States.

Thus it appears during a period of four years the average of deposits was less than $10,000,000.

More recently, and it is not necessary for my purpose that I should be in possession of exact information as to the time, large deposits have been made in banks in various parts of the country, but more largely in New York than elsewhere. These deposits so made have been used by the banks in common with deposits obtained from other sources for the extension of loans proportionate to the deposits received. It will appear, probably, from examination that the loans by banks are very nearly in all conditions of the money market an equivalent substantially to the deposits they may have on hand at the time when the loans are made. The bank statements appear to justify this conclusion—that the loans rise and fall with the amount of deposits in the respective banks. Thus it may happen that the ability of banks in the aggregate to make loans to customers, whether for general purposes or for particular uses, must depend largely upon the deposits that they may receive. Thus the question whether the deposits by the government of the United States in the banks of the country shall be $10,000,000 or $170,000,000 at any particular moment or through long periods of time must have a large influence over the ability of the banks in the aggregate to make provision for the wants of their customers.

It is manifest that the banks have contributed largely to the ability of the trusts to organize and carry into execution their purpose to so combine the forces of a particular industry as to enable the managers to control the products of that industry, and thus to control the market of the country. It has been stated that the banks were holding securities of the various trusts to the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars.

It must be true that the banks are holding these securities in large amounts, but it is not necessary that the magnitude should be known to the public an an aid to an opinion that the policy policy of the government of the United States in making these deposits has contributed very largely to the ability of the trust organizers to execute their purposes in defiance of a wise public policy, and largely against the public interests.

In one respect the situation does not correspond to the situation in 1837 and 1838, when it became necessary for Mr. Van Buren's administration to demand a return of the deposits that had been made in the pet banks, but in one respect the position is not dissimilar. If the deposits in the national banks amount to $170,000,000, a demand for the return of $40,000,000 will produce a panic throughout the country and involve a depression of business which would be fatal to many interests. An increase of the amount deposited with the banks, while it furnishes temporary relief for the money market and an improvement for the day in the price of stocks, augments the evil which the increase in the amount of deposits was intended to relieve.

Thus it has come to pass that the government of the United States has contributed to the evil of the trust system, and that the means which have been employed for the relief of the money market have increased the ability of the trusts to continue in existence and to continue a process by which the money of the country is used to perpetuate the trusts, which are the consumers of money beyond the natural wants of the country.

Thus it may have come to pass that the deposit of $100,000,000 or $170,000,000 in the banks of the United States has made it possible for the trusts to organize, to continue in existence and to absorb from month to month the deposits made in the banks for the purpose of relieving the money market which, except for the trusts, would not require relief.

Coincident with this system of deposits in the national banks, arrangements have been made by which several banks have been reorganized under one head, and the capital of the single bank has been made equal to the combined capitals of the banks so organized. Under the statute of the United States the liabilities of an individual are limited to ten per cent. of the capital of a bank. If five banks of $1,000,000 capital each are organized under one head with a capital of $5,000,000, it becomes possible for a single individual or a single corporation to secure

by loans five times the amount that could have been obtained from any one of the banks previous to the reorganization. This arrangement may have aided materially in fostering the large organizations known as trusts by increasing the means of the managers to obtain loans.

In view of the facts stated, some general observations are pertinent. The provision in the independent treasury bill by which the secretary of the treasury was authorized to make deposits in the national banks under certain circumstances had reference in the minds of the legislators and of the Democratic party that such a provision would be necessary for the transaction of the public business, but it was not contemplated that through it means should be devised for the restoration of a policy which the independent treasury bill was designed to supersede.

The question in 1844 was this: Shall the money of the United States that may be collected by taxes from time to time be held in the treasury of the United States and used for the purposes of the government exclusively, or shall it be placed in banks and loaned to dealers and money borrowers. The latter policy was rejected. The language used in the statute justifies the loan to banks of whatever funds there may be in the treasury of the United States, but it must be manifest that such was not the intention of the authors of the law, and the question arises now, as it arose sixty years ago, whether or not the people of the country should be taxed for the purpose of raising money to be loaned first to the banks of the country and through them to the corporations and individuals engaged in business or in speculative undertakings. The construction that has been placed practically upon the independent treasury system has led to the defeat of the object for which the independent system was established.

Thus the question has been brought home to the country whether the independent treasury system should be abandoned or whether an attempt should be made for its restoration to the uses for which it was originally designed. One of the late reports gives $171,000,000 as the sum total of the deposits. As a practical business proposition either the taxes should have been so reduced that this amount of money should not have been withdrawn from the people, or else, upon its withdrawal it should have been applied to the payment of the public debt. The money was collected by taxes, placed in the treasury and loaned

to the banks without interest. It may be assumed fairly that if there had been no deposits beyond what might be necessary for public uses, the banks would have made provision for all the wants of legitimate business.

At the present time a menace is impending over the business of the country corresponding to that which was created by the passage of Mr. Clay's bill in 1832. There is a large demand for a modification of the tariff system. That demand is met by the declaration that there can be no modification of the tariff until after the election of 1904. That declaration contains what will be treated as a purpose that when that election shall have taken place, and a Congress shall have been elected and shall have assembled, the tariff system is to be revised.

In the meantime it will be the part of wisdom for every manufacturer to limit his production to the present demand, for every importer to limit his operations to the month in which they are made, and the consequence will be a general depression of business which will increase with the passage of time.

Thus has the object for which the independent treasury system was enacted been subverted and a return has been made indirectly to a policy which ended in the disastrous business depression of 1838 and the overthrow of the old Democratic party of 1840.

And thus have the people been called to bear a system of taxation largely in excess of the wants of the government, and thus has the treasury of the United States become indirectly responsible for the business of the country and for the stability of the banks to furnish means for doing business.

If by these means an elastic currency has been secured, the end has been reached by a system of taxation beyond the wants of the government, and by the loan of the proceeds thereof to the national banks, upon sufficient security, no doubt, but always without interest.

REMARKS BY MRS. MARY A. LIVERMORE.

If I have gained nothing else here, I have gained information. I have felt so angry and stirred since you began to talk about this subject. I think I shall be a little more active in the future than I have been in the past. Though when we become octogenarians I think we need to exercise a little economy of speech, because with so much behind us we are liable to talk a

great deal more than is really necessary. Gov. Boutwell and I have lived through the same period. I know all about Andrew Jackson and the United States banks, and I passed a good deal of time in Philadelphia when the quarrel was at the highest. I have also lived in the South in the darkest days of slavery, and I came home as an abolitionist, only to be told to "shut up," and to be informed that it wasn't a proper thing to talk about. I think Gov. Boutwell is quite right when he tells us that nothing is going to advance the good cause in which we are all engaged except an appeal to certain material interests. As for myself, I cannot do anything. Why, I am as badly off as the Filipinos! I have for half a century been slowly, with a company of other women, trying to obtain for women the rights which you want for the Filipinos—the right to vote, to have a voice in the representation, and to effect something. I think I have got a good deal of the Filipino spirit in my veins which enables me to sympathize with the work you are doing for the Filipinos. I ask that the Declaration of Independence shall be exercised upon me and upon women generally—that we may be allowed to be represented. Then, my brothers, we could help you men. We cannot do much now. I have been driven, as have a great many others, to the thought of the omnipotence of moral power. I have become a thorough convert to that great doctrine—the doctrine that nothing which is good ever fails. I am obliged to rely upon that and to feel that we are coming out eventually all right. I remember how the great disabilities of women have yet to be removed; and they are to be removed largely in the way we have been going on—by making converts. This power outside of ourselves that makes for righteousness has done the great work—the work of bringing the whole race up to where it is today. So I am compelled to depend on moral utterances. When I was young it was not thought right to speak out. I do not expect to hear anyone deny that right here. So part of my thunder is gone. I came here because I believe we are largely wrong—going astray in the principles of the Republic through the delusion we have all been living in, that America is the Messiah of the race. When waiting, once, at a railway station in Berne, Switzerland, I said to my husband, "I really believe there is a young fellow yonder wearing the badge of the Grand Army of the Republic." He said, "That is not possible. It isn't possible that a German railway porter should be here wearing the badge of the Grand

Army of the Republic. Now, don't go running about after him, for I shall not know where you are." The man came nearer, and I could see it was really a badge of the Grand Army of the Republic. So I forget everything, went to him, and began to talk to him about it. He said he served during the whole four years in our Civil war, enlisting in June, 1861, and being mustered out in October, 1865, because he lost his health and was therefore taken into the invalid corps, afterwards remaining in the hospital until the whole thing was over. Said he: "I receive my pension regularly. There are five brothers of us, four having families. I am unmarried, but I have an old father and mother who need me, but when I am free I am going back to my country." "You are a brave man," I said. "Ah," he replied, "It is a good country that you and I belong to. It is the Messiah of the nations." So we Americans have come to feel that about everything we do is and has been right. In the case of Cuba, liberated from the Spaniards, we took her under our benevolent care. And now, of course, she will be delighted to be annexed to the United States Republic! I remember the argument that was used when there was talk about the annexation of the Sandwich Islands to America. They said that if we did not take them England would be going around picking up everything and taking possession of it. They said we must annex the Sandwich Islands and thus save them from the domination of an empire; and now what have they got? We have thought too highly of our country. We have been too boastful of it. We have become too much infected with the pride of it, and have thought we were better, a little better, than the other nations. My dear friends, I am not going to talk any more. I am going to stop immediately. I am an optimist of the optimists, and my optimism has a good, sure foundation, and it is based on the everlasting God who thought of us in love and brought us into being. He has watched over us and all who have preceded us straight on to the present time, but He waited until He had got the solar system in order and our earth fit for habitation before He brought us here. And as He cared for our country through all our history all through the past, while we were going to the right and to the left, after all manner of false gods, He has, with all our faults and failings, preserved us. My faith is in Him. We are His children, born into His love, light and guidance, and we shall eventually come out of these difficulties.

REMARKS BY MR. GEORGE E. McNEILL.

Our battle is against the spirit of imperialism, and that spirit is manifested, not only through the political form of government, but also through the industrial forms of society. We are met here today lamenting the fact that we are living under an imperial government, that we are forgetting we ever lived under a democratic government, that it is absolutely impossible to have a monarchical system of industry and a democratic system of government, and that a man who submits 364 days in the year to an industrial boss can easily submit on that other 365th day. The root of the matter is the industrial situation, and the hope of the Anti-Imperialist League is not only to be found in the essays of our professors, learned and able as they are, but in the spirit of the plain people. The hope of this country rests in the organized labor movement of this country; and the background of the Anti-Imperialist League is the convention of the Federation of Labor which recently met in this city. Forty years ago the declaration was made that unless industry was made democratic your political government would be made monarchical; and it did not require any spirit of prophecy to anticipate what a letter which the Secretary just read deplores. A gentleman writes, apparently surprised that this episode, this last violation of all the traditions of our country, this creating of revolution in Panama, this acknowledgement of a secession government, should not have aroused the people, and that the people are not making the air ring with their protests. Of course they are not making it ring with their protests! If we want simply to free the Filipinos or the Philippine Islands, we must appeal to the pockets of the American people. And nothing will ever release the Filipino or the Philippine Islands unless you can prove that they do not pay—that it doesn't pay to hold them. That is the spirit of imperialism. Imperialism means avarice; democracy means aspiration. Imperialism means bullets, and democracy means ballots. So you might go on through the alphabet. You may say I am angry, that I am emotional, that I appeal to the feelings. I do so because I have feelings; and there is no hope for this movement until you arouse the people to anger at the condtions which exist. We ought not to boast of our country. We ought to blush, if we desire to hold up our heads among the nations of the world. We have to commence in earnest a new

order of society—a society reaching to the very base of things—a society that recognizes that the man who produces property is entitled to the product of his labor, and is not to be deprived of any part of it in the interest of any other person or people. Now this is an Anti-Imperialist speech, not one such as you have commonly heard, but my pleasure and my duty is, if possible, to stir you with some sense of the fact that we are not a free republican government—that we are monarchical, that we are imperialistic, despotic, and that you need not look upon this phenomenon in the Philippine Islands with astonishment—upon that war with Spain, upon the outrages perpetrated in Panama—but only see in these things the development of an industrial system founded in injustice and despotism.

REMARKS BY THE REV. R. L. BISBEE.

I realize all the force of what Gov. Boutwell has said about the tendencies of this empire, and we have not found out enough about what not to do—that is, the world has not—to prevent us from going astray. As a matter of fact, I will simply say that if I had time to enlarge upon it, I think I could convince you, though I do not know that you need to be convinced, that we ought to enlarge the scope of this League and make it a great, general, deep-seated movement in the interests of genuine democracy. The question of the Philippines is a subordinate question. That is merely the symptom of a disease which is very deep-seated. So, also, of this Panama question. We have bad blood in the nation. Ours is an era when original, genuine democracy is making the struggle of its life against an almost overwhelming oligarchy of power. I might make a two-hours' speech in this line, but I shall spare you on this occasion.

REMARKS OF THE REV. CHAS. GORDON AMES.

It is written that "punishment, though lame of foot, hath seldom failed to overtake a criminal." The punishment of our national crimes against liberty, justice and humanity has come sooner than was expected, but in the natural order. In a certain catechism, the question is asked, "What is the punishment of meanness?" Answer, "More meanness." Perhaps, in these days of rapid transit, punishment travels faster than in the old,

slow days. Read the papers; look at public situations and events, note the tone of political discussions; and then ask, What virus has been injected into the veins of the Republic that has so poisoned the national mind and conscience?

I do not refer all evils to the new-born passion of imperialism, or lust for dominion; indeed, I think it would have been impossible, in 1898, for our government to enter on a course of criminal aggression and annexation by conquest, had not the national standard been already lowered by bad politics, material prosperity, and greed for ill-gotten gains. The soil was ready for the evil seed, and the growth has been quick and rank. The tares sprang up among the wheat, and the best life of our country, vigorous and hopeful as it is, finds itself partly choked by the worst. The older men will bear me out in saying that the last five years have brought to light more disasters and scandals in the circles of legislation and administration than were heard of in the first century of this nation's life. So many unclean birds in the eagle's nest! In many and large ways we are still making an honorable and illustrious record. But why these ugly stains? There is no joy in asking or answering that question; yet to ask and answer it is a patriot's duty. Our meanness has produced its natural harvest of "more meanness." We read with indignation of extensive attempts to steal the public lands with the connivance of federal officers. Were we overscrupulous in seizing the faraway islands? We read of multiplying raids on the national treasury and on the treasuries of states and cities; of postal frauds with hundreds of smirched reputations; of gigantic combinations for plundering the many to enrich the few. But who set the example of exploiting a whole population in the interest of trade? We read of the President's fear that his earnest attempt to bring offenders to justice will fail through the lack of integrity or of courage on the part of juries. But has not the whole body of citizens been too complacently familiar with the proceedings of courts-martial, which only served to whitewash or deny the most atrocious and notorious violations of the laws of war, followed by the brazen claim that every offense had been diligently hunted down and amply punished?

We have been startled and alarmed by the reappearance of the old slave power—a defiant ghost, rising out of a bloody grave, taking to itself a new body, vaulting into the saddle, and riding rough-shod over the rights of the still childish freed

people and over the prostrate form of the constitution. But who began to pooh-pooh the doctrine of equal human rights in order to justify the domination of white people over a so-called inferior race on the other side of the globe? If the land does not ring with protests when new and cruel obstructions are heaped across the difficult path of our colored fellow-countrymen, is it not because our treatment of 7,000,000 Filipinos has padlocked our lips?

Thus the tidal wave of jingoism which carried our ships and soldiers to Manila has flowed back to drench us with a flood of disorders, corruptions and hypocricies. Nor is this all. The same deluge has loosened our own foundations; has unsettled our most sacred traditions of the divine origin of liberty and law; has smuggled in strange and dangerous precedents. Who would have believed that the American people, after all their virtuous eloquence about Poland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Ireland and the South American republics, would have consented to clothe their own President with despotic power over 7,000,000 people struggling for self-government; so that whatever liberty or protection they may enjoy depends solely upon his will; so that it is possible for him, and his agents, to make them pay the expenses of their own continuous subjugation? Who, even six short years ago, would have dared to predict that America, after liberating Cuba, would step into the cast-off shoes of Spain as the foreign ruler of a conquered people?

Worse still, perhaps, as a menace to the honor of the Republic, and to its amicable relations with any weaker nations that may be in its path, is the smiling familiarity of our people with the spectacle of our army and navy ever ready to be used for aggression, with no check from public opinion. Whatever wicked work may be done under the flag, by the present or any future administration, the only party likely to be called to account will be the Little Americans who decline to join in the huzzas. Worst of all is the blasphemy of thanking heaven for our prosperity and power, while scoffing at "the higher law" whenever it interferes with our material aggrandizement or our chosen policy.

To one who loves his country, much of the news of the day is not pleasant reading; and I do not envy the man who quite enjoys making or hearing this kind of speech. Can anything be said to take the bitter taste out of our mouths? Always this: In the long run, the devil, with all his shrewdness, turns out to be an

ass; and the gates of hell do not prevail. We need not lose our faith in God or in man, or in the fortunes of the Republic. In the long conflict of truth with error or right with wrong, the cosmic powers can be trusted; they are more than conquerors. There is no unmixed evil in the universe, and nothing turns out as we dream and plan. The wrongdoers strut and bluster, but they tremble. They, too, have consciences; else why try to persuade themselves that dishonorable deeds can be disguised by virtuous names? The drama is not yet played out. If the cup of iniquity is not yet full, so neither is the cup of retribution; and retribution is often one stage in the process of redemption.

What comes next? We shall reap as we sow. After intoxication comes headache. After our bullying methods have embroiled us with foreign powers, and secured the ill-will of our neighbors, north and south,—after our crooked precedents come boomeranging back to plague us, the nation smarting under wholesome discipline, will call down its Carthaginian statesmen, and listen to counsels of sobriety. Human liberty has cost too much to be given up just as the world is rolling into the light of a larger day. The children's children of the deluded imperialists will yet thank God for those who stood for the good old cause in the days that tried men's souls.

REMARKS OF THE REV. CHARLES W. WENDTE.

Mr. President:—

At the time of the outbreak of the Spanish-American war and our occupation of the Philippines I was a citizen of California. A residence of seventeen years in that state, and large acquaintance with every section of it, have perhaps qualified me to represent,—though in no sense officially,—the Anti-Imperialist sentiment of that part of our common country.

At first sight it may seem as if the public opinion of California were absolutely unanimous in favor of the policy of the administration with regard to the Philippines. It is certainly sustained by the overwhelming voice of the people and press of the Golden State. Under the stimulus of the great war expenditures on the Pacific coast, which became for the time the seat of the naval and military demonstrations of our government, there was created among the people of California, a

plausible, even if supremely selfish reason for upholding a war which undeniably brought them great material advantages, and awakened them from the commercial lethargy into which they had latterly fallen. With large immediate benefits accruing to them from the American occupation of the Philippines and the naval operations on the Pacific, it is not surprising that the great moral issues involved in the Imperialistic policy, and its ultimate effects upon our whole nation, have been but slightly considered by the people of California. The newly created prosperity of their state and the magnificent dream of empire over the continents and isles of the Pacific have, for the time at least, dazzled out of sight the fundamental principles of humanity and morality, and international justice. This prevailing sentiment on the Pacific coast makes more conspicuous and admirable the high motives, personal courage and lofty Americanism of those citizens of California who, despite all threats and blandishments, in the face of overwhelming public opinion, have been loyal to the principles of liberty and brotherhood, and international righteousness. Among the men who have not hesitated to avow their convictions and deliver their testimony concerning the great issues involved in the American occupation of the Philippines, I would name the late J. J. Valentine, president of the Wells, Fargo Express Co., one of the most eminent financiers, and most public-spirited and influential citizens of the Golden State, who wore out his life in noble endeavors for the public enlightment and welfare; Warren Olney, a leading attorney, veteran of the Civil War, and upright public servant, who was recently accorded the rare honor of a joint nomination on the Republican, Democratic and Independent tickets, and a triumphant election as mayor of a reform administration in the city of Oakland; John P. Irish, the most eloquent voice on the Pacific coast, a federal office-holder, but dissenting from the policy of the administration in the Philippines; Rev. Chas. R. Brown, the able and out-spoken pastor of the largest Protestant church on the Pacific coast; Chas. F. Lummis, the brilliant and fearless editor of Southern California; and David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford university; a man of profound culture, sanity of intellect and moral purpose, towering among his contemporaries as the Sequoia Gigantiea lifts its huge bulk above its companions of the forest—these are among the public men who in that young and growing community plead for the cause of political sanity and

justice, and a return to the sound principles of the Fathers of the Republic. Their demand is that our armies be withdrawn from the Philippines as speedily as possible, that this unfortunate people be given their political independence, and permitted—nay, aided to form their own government according to their own desires and aspirations.

As a representative of this Anti-Imperialist opinion in California I appear before you today to base these demands not on sentiment alone, although sentiment has surely its large rights in this discussion, but on every consideration of political wisdom and national honor and safety. The American subjugation of the Philippines has been a political and military blunder of the first magnitude. It has cost vast sums of money, it has involved acts of unfairness, if not treachery towards the Filipino revolutionary armies who would, without doubt, have themselves accomplished the defeat of their Spanish oppressors. Unfortunately they were misled into accepting as allies and sympathizers with their national aspirations a conquering host which afterward inflicted upon them a tyranny but little better than that of Spain, however plausibly disguised under the term "benevolent assimilation." Our military occupation of the Philippines has been attended with a destruction of property and loss of life fearful to contemplate and with acts of cruelty on the part of individuals wearing the United States uniform which have brought deep disgrace upon our Republic. Earnest endeavors have since been made to remedy and atone for these great wrongs and outrages by placing in command of the army and insular government men of high character and kindly purpose, and introducing various characteristic features of Anglo-Saxon civilization among this oriental people. But they are proving, one after another, to be failures, and this first, because they came too late to wipe out the bloodshed and injustice with which our American rule over the islands has been accompanied. Second, because these Anglo-Saxon ideas and institutions are not congenial to the mind or compatible with the social and industrial conditions of an oriental people. The true evolution of such a people must be gradual and along their own natural lines of development, as has been shown strikingly in the case of their sister nation Japan, and not a mere graft or veneer of alien civilization suddenly forced upon them from without. Lastly, we have failed because our attempts to introduce modern culture and Republican institutions into that un-

happy country were not based on the fundamental condition of a democratic order of society, the right of self-government and complete national independence. It is because we have accorded this independence and national autonomy to the other colony which we wrestled from Spain, the island of Cuba, that we behold that young republic today, tranquil, content, and hostile populations of the Philippines, impoverished, desolated with famine and war, and ceaselessly conspiring for the well-governed and prosperous, in happy contrast to the sullen one great boon which we deny them, their political liberty. Moreover, it has become apparent to all, save the apologists and partizans of the administration, that every commercial privilege, every industrial concession, every stragetic naval point, every political advantage, every missionary opportunity which we hoped to gain by our occupation of the Philippines might be ours in just as great, nay in even greater measure, if we granted them their freedom and, withdrawing our army and navy, contented ourselves with simply becoming to them "the most favored nation," their allies, protectors and friends.

The retention of the Philippines, therefore, far from being a source of strength to us, is an element of weakness. Let me cite a great authority on this point. The eminent English statesman, Wm. E. Gladstone, in the course of a tribute to the United States said: "She has, taking the capacity of her land in view, as well as mere measurement, a natural base for the greatest continuous empire ever established by man. And," he continues, "it may be well here to mention, what has not always been sufficiently observed, that this distinction between continuous empire and empire dispersed over sea is vital."

Yet it is this great natural advantage of continuous empire, of a realm whose populations shall be self-contained and contiguous, this prerogative of our nation which the great English statesman held to be so unique and vital, which we are now called upon to surrender at the behest of an erratic and strenuous administration, and to exchange for an empire dispersed among thousands of islands, thousands of miles away from the great bulk of our territory and population. Is it not apparent that every such insular acquisition is an element of political weakness and not of strength? It presents isolated and exposed points of our national domain which, in case of conflict, an enemy would inevitably attack, and which it would be the part of national honor for us to defend at any cost of men and

treasure, however valueless the possession itself might be to us. Nay, the very possibility of such an aggression leads us to make large and costly preparations to fortify and maintain it, thus greatly increasing the expense of our army and navy, and encouraging the war spirit among our people. And this with little or no corresponding benefit to either our finances or our political morality. Hence we affirm that the Philippine islands under American dominion are a menace to our territorial integrity and national safety. As a possession the Philippines have been shown again and again, and by no one more convincingly than by a member of this association, Mr. Edward Atkinson, to be most unprofitable and undesirable. In his latest pamphlet, Mr. Atkinson shows that the effort to conquer and hold in subjection the Philippines has cost the United States government over 600 millions of dollars, (the total expense of the Spanish-American war having been 920 millions); the expenditure on this account during the last fiscal year was 152 millions of dollars. Yet the exports from this country to the Philippines were almost ridiculously small, amounting during the same period to less than 6 1-2 cents per head of our population, on which the profits were less than one cent a head. No wonder the great nations of Europe, our rivals in business and international ambition, vigorously applaud a policy which exhausts our resources, commits us to the same unjust methods of territorial aggrandizement and the exploitation of the weaker peoples of the earth which they have so long pursued, and seals our lips when outrages against liberty and justice are committed in any part of the world.

From an economic point of view the continued American occupation of the Philippines is a profound mistake. If the enormous sums which have been and are being wasted for no other apparent purpose than to "save the face" of the administration in its palpable and costly blundering, were devoted to the development of our own "continuous empire," and to making it the fertile dwelling place of millions of our American people now in depressed and miserable circumstances—what an immense gain would have resulted to the material and moral welfare of our nation!

In the single state of California, it has been reckoned that if the great interior valley, which extends for 500 miles north and south, and is partially watered by the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, were properly developed by means of

irrigation, settlement and tillage, it would sustain in comfort and prosperity a population of at least 10,000,000 of people. At present it numbers a few hundred thousands. The state of California contains 158,000 square miles of territory. This enormous area can be better appreciated when I state that it is as large as all New England, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware together. Yet this vast territory contains at present less than a million and a half of people, while to the north and east are other large but sparsely settled states, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Arizona, Utah and New Mexico, whose agricultural and mineral riches are as yet only superficially exploited, but which with proper reclamation, under government supervision, would furnish ample support for as great a population as is now contained within the borders of our entire country.

Here, then, is an opportunity for empire, for national expansion grander than any dreamed of by the most ardent of Imperialists, an expansion legitimate, safe and advantageous to our whole people, and to every other nation on the face of the earth. It is on the line of that "continuous empire," in which Mr. Gladstone rightly saw our national strength and safety. It involves no conflict with other races, no unjust aggression, no military conquests, no entrance into the complications and quarrels of the other nations of the world.

It is not yet too late to divert from useless expenditure in Eastern countries the millions which ought to be devoted to the development of this wonderful heritage which we have received from Divine Providence. It is impossible to believe that our American people will much longer remain blind to their true material and moral interests, and continue this ruinous and wicked policy of criminal aggression on a far distant and oriental people. Sooner or later they must realize how they have been misled by unwise and incompetent leaders. Then a mighty reaction in public sentiment will take place. The aggressive and unscrupulous elements in our body politic will no longer be in control of the government. Wiser, more just, humane and pacific counsels will prevail in our national administration. We shall cultivate closer and more amicable relations with the nations of the earth, relations of barter and exchange, of travel and intercourse, of civilization and humanity. Awakening from this wild and fevered dream of territorial expansion in other hemispheres, of national aggran-

dizement by force of arms, of the subjugation and exploitation of weaker peoples, we shall realize that the true ideals of America are freedom, justice and brotherhood, both at home and abroad. The strenuous will give place to the just and friendly life, and "Universal peace lie like a shaft of light across the land, through all the circle of the golden year."

The meeting then dissolved.

325.373
N44
v.6

You are earnestly asked to hand this, after reading, to some other person who will also give it careful consideration.

REPORT

OF THE

Sixth Annual Meeting

OF THE

Anti-Imperialist League

NOVEMBER 26, 1904

AND ITS ADJOURNMENT

NOVEMBER 28

PUBLISHED BY
THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,
20 Central Street, Boston.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

Class Book Volume

Je 07-2M

JX1393
N4A4

REPORT

The sixth annual meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League was held on November 26, 1904, the last Saturday in November, at the office of the Secretary, at twelve o'clock noon, and was adjourned to the rooms of the Twentieth Century Club, 2 Ashburton Place, on Monday, November 28. Ater a luncheon, the meeting was called to order by the Hon. George S. Boutwell, the reading of the records being dispensed with.

ADDRESS BY THE HON. GEORGE S. BOUTWELL.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am glad to see so many good Anti-Imperialists at this meeting. Whatever may happen in the years that are near us, one of two events is to happen ultimately:—Either imperialism is to be trodden down in America or the empire is to become a permanency. Which shall it be? That is the question, not before us alone, but before the people of Massachusetts, of the country, and indeed it is before the whole world. All are interested in the great problem whether, in this country where republicanism, as an idea and as the foundation on which institutions were placed, is to disappear,—first the idea and then the institutions,—or whether, out of these difficulties, there is to come a new birth of freedom for the people of this country, giving again to the world a republican government founded upon republican ideas and destined to last in the mind of mankind as long as there shall be a genuine belief in the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal. If this be not so, then there is nothing that can survive on which the hopes of mankind can rest as to the future. There can be no government by the

P16596

people, there can be no general freedom, there can be no real continuance of public life in the future if it be not true that all men are created free and equal.

Ladies and gentlemen, I invite you to the consideration of a view of affairs which at first will not be acceptable to you. Perhaps when I shall have closed my brief remarks you may accept an opinion that you do not now entertain.

Since the election of November 8, I have been pursued by two half lines from Shakespeare:

"Out of this nettle, danger,
We pluck this flower, safety."

Then came an inquiry to me which I transfer to you:

Is it possible out of the election of President Roosevelt by a majority so large as to preclude the thought that he is not the choice of the American people and upon their best judgment, to find foothold for a reasonable conjecture that a way may be opened for the independence of the Philippine Islands, for the realization of the hopes of Mabini, of Aguinaldo and of other patriots and representatives of their country and race and for the formation of a government resting upon the opinion of the people, all incident to and consequent upon the withdrawal of our army and civil government?

Is it possible thus to illumine the future by a conjecture that the empire may soon disappear and that the republic may have a new birth?

If the millions who voted for President Roosevelt are all imperialists then our conjecture is only a vain vagary.

First of all it may be said that President Roosevelt has a personal following far in excess of the popularity that was generally conceded to him. This popularity rested upon qualities in the man that were in no visible way connected with his opinions or policy concerning imperialism. Indeed, of the main part of his personal supporters it may be said that they were indifferent to his views upon imperialism. To them he was and is the representative of a personal vigorous public policy by which the United States might be advanced to the first place among the nations of the earth. The election shows a personal following such as did not exist in the case of Mr. Blaine or of Mr. Clay or of General Jackson. That following in its personality is not to be considered in the future political contests of the country.

While the Democratic Party in its platform and its candi-

date was acceptable to the Anti-Imperialists it is to be said that Judge Parker was deficient in the personal and individual characteristics which were attractive and commanding in President Roosevelt. Thence it came to pass that while men of all grades and conditions saw in Judge Parker a most excellent President if in office, but as a candidate they saw only an eminent person who could not command an election.

Hence the Democratic compaign was conducted without hope of success and consequently without vigor.

There were others who said, unjustly and unwisely, as I think, the Democratic Party is insincere in its platform concerning imperialism, and there were others who feared the accession of the Democratic Party to power as a danger to business prosperity. Many Republicans and many Democrats as well, who are demanding reciprocal trade with Canada, said the election of Parker is not a success for us. The Republicans will control the Senate. We must force Mr. Lodge and the Republican Party to accept our demand. Hence the Republican vote in Massachusetts met the most sanguine expectations of the friends of President Roosevelt.

We are, however, to pass in review a coincident event before the opinion of Massachusetts upon imperialism can be announced. Mr. Douglas was an open Anti-Imperialist. Gov. Bates was a supporter of the imperialistic policy of President McKinley and President Roosevelt.

Thus was the issue made between freedom and tyranny, between the policy of Lord North and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. In this issue Massachusetts was herself again, but more instructive even is the lesson taught by the vote in the Eighth district. Mr. McCall is known over the country as an Anti-Imperialist of an early date and of unyielding consistency. He is elected by a majority so large that the majorities given to President Roosevelt upon a percentage basis are insignificant. The Eighth district does not stand alone. It is not better than the First district or the Thirteenth district. If in each district the Republican candidate had stood with Mr. McCall his majority would have been equally significant. Thus Massachusetts in this election, as she has had opportunity, asserts herself for freedom, for equality, for self-government, not only at home but at places remote as well as near.

If a plebiscit vote could be taken, Massachusetts would

denounce the policy of President McKinley and President Roosevelt by a majority of not less than three to one. Massachusetts is not alone in the cause of human freedom, she has never been alone. President Roosevelt did not receive the vote of Massachusetts in consequence of his imperialistic policy, but rather in spite of it. Gov. Bates stood for President Roosevelt, and in the contest between Roosevelt and Douglas, President Roosevelt was defeated.

If we are asked to furnish proof that the Administration is pledged to grant to the Philippines the opportunity for self-government whenever the inhabitants are qualified to exercise the power with wisdom, we may be unable to meet the demand, yet in a further discussion of the subject I shall assume that the Administration is so pledged. If so pledged and the pledge shall be kept, then out of this nettle, danger, we may pluck this flower, safety.

We are able to say to the Administration, if you recognize this pledge then we are able to show from your records and reports that the time has come when the pledge should be kept.

You have taken a census and you have found that of a total population of less than eight million more than seven million are civilized. Consult the authorities if you will, and everywhere you will be told that a civilized people are capable of maintaining an orderly government. The cause of the Filipinos is strengthened by the historical fact that such a government existed in Luzon when we entered Manila in May, 1898. On this evidence we may say to the President, you are holding eight million human beings in involuntary servitude who of right ought to be free. You have a lease and scope of power such as have not been given to any of your predecessors unless Washington and Grant may be named as exceptions. We may say to the President, you have four years of this freedom before you in which time you can perform this signal act of justice and which if now neglected by you we ask when and by whom of your successors can you expect the redemption of this pledge that you have given?

Do you ask for a people now under your jurisdiction and control who are capable of self-government? Your answer is in the census taken of your command and by your own agents.

Do you ask for power? It is to be found in the majorities given to President Roosevelt the 8th day of November.

Do you ask for an opportunity? It is to be found in these

four years of freedom in power such as has never before been granted.

One more question I ask of President Roosevelt and of the Congress that he leads and controls. If, under these circumstances, with this opportunity before you, if you refrain, if you neglect, if you refuse,—when and by whom do you expect that the pledge which you have given will be redeemed?

If you wish to secure for the Republican Party a lease of power corresponding to the grant made to Mr. Lincoln in 1864 in recognition of the emancipation of four million slaves, the opportunity is now before you:—Bring the army and the civil government out of the Philippine Islands and thus elevate eight million human beings from involuntary servitude to personal freedom, self-government and statehood among the nations of the earth.

But whatever may have been done by the Administration and without regard to the wisdom or unwisdom of its future policy, we may claim that Massachusetts has passed out from under the suspicion of being an imperialistic state. This is a victory that in its far-reaching results may be a full set-off to any evil consequences that may follow the election of President Roosevelt.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.

Boston, November 26, 1904.

It is plain that a cause like that which the Anti-Imperialist League is formed to promote cannot yet succeed as a paramount political question upon which a popular verdict may be gained. Apparently only the minority of the nation and perhaps a small minority has been aroused to take an active interest in the conduct of affairs in a remote part of the world, although involving great expense, suffering and loss of life, and it is still more obvious that no sufficient interest has been excited by the moral and constitutional questions involved in the departure which has taken place from the standards and the practice of the United States previous to 1898. It is our duty in the existing state of things to maintain our efforts for progressive popular education, to take advantage of every opportunity to induce the political party in power to advance steps which may lead to Filipino independence and to watch with

such helpfulness as we may be able to exert the condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands and the other outlying territorial possessions and the progress of legislation in this country bearing upon their interests.

Certainly no one can regret, because they have gone down to defeat, that the platform of the Democratic Party and so many leaders of that party, including its candidate for the presidency, took up the cause of anti-imperialism and made it a part of their campaign. The opportunity has been given as it was given four years ago to prove that our cause was a living and an active one with many strong arguments drawn from the existing situation to enforce it, and although the arguments employed and the evidence presented were discredited by partisans in the heat of the campaign, they have not been urged in vain, but have planted seeds which will grow up and bear fruit in thought, inquiry and investigation. These facts remain,—that the Anti-Imperialist cause found outspoken adherents, though unofficially, in many Republican quarters, that it was officially championed by the Democratic Party and that the very important petition signed by more than seven thousand names, including those of the most prominent judges, lawyers, educators, professional and business men of the country, directed to the Republican and Democratic National Political Conventions and asking for Philippine independence, showed what progress the cause of anti-imperialism had made among thinking men in the United States.

It has become evident that this cause of ours is too persistent to die, that, as for so long a time it has not got settled, it cannot have been settled right, and thus we may take courage to go on with our propaganda with unabated ardor. Of course, its object is Philippine independence, but to those who prefer to think of the value of their work, day by day, rather than of its effect in approximating a high ideal, we may point to the remarkable words of Secretary Taft at Cambridge, when he said that the work of the Anti-Imperialists had been "of value in upholding the standard of the government in the Islands because it has put that government on trial and has made every member of it strain himself to make it worthy of support." We think we can assure our friends who are conducting civil and military affairs in the Philippine Islands that they will continue to have the stimulating advantage of a strong opposition until we can do them the crowning favor of their

final and permanent removal!

The history of the year may be briefly told. We have distributed about 100,000 documents, the greater part newly published by us, some former publications still timely in their scope, and some furnished us by friendly societies and individuals. The titles of the new documents which we have circulated this year are subjoined.

The Cost of War and Warfare. Edward Atkinson. Oct. 9, 1903.

Report of the Fifth Annual Meeting and Its Adjournment, November 28 and 30, 1903.

Address at the Luncheon of the Anti-Imperialist League. Prof. William James, Twentieth Century Club, Nov. 30, 1903.

Extract from Treasurer's Report. Leaflet.

The Duty of Americans in the Philippines. Senate Document 191, 58th Congress, 2d Session. Address. The Hon. William Howard Taft, before the Union Reading College, Manila, December 17, 1903.

The Union of Democracy. Address before the Lewis Cass Club. The Hon. Alfred Lucking, December 21, 1903.

Speech on the Panama Question. Hon. Thomas M. Patterson, United States Senate, January 19 and 20, 1904.

The Cost of War and Warfare. Edward Atkinson. January 26, 1904.

Speech on the Panama Question. Hon. E. W. Carmack, United States Senate, February 9, 1904.

The Recognition of Panama. The Hon. Moorfield Storey.

Ahab's Vineyard. Leaflet.

Bushel of Hornets. Leaflet. Dr. W. A. Croffut.

Conditions in the Philippines. Leaflet. Erving Winslow.

The Democracy's Opportunity. The Hon. Grover Cleveland. Reprinted from the Saturday Evening Post, February 20, 1904.

Extract from the same. Leaflet.

The Principles for which the American Revolution Was Fought. Address before the Ohio Sons of the Revolution, Queen City Club, Cincinnati, Ohio. The Hon. Rufus B. Smith, February 22, 1904.

Extract from an Address. Secretary Taft. Leaflet. Cincinnati, February 22, 1904.

The Philippine Policy of Secretary Taft Analyzed. The Hon.

Moorfield Storey.

The Philippine Census. Leaflet.

Conditions in the Philippines. Senate Document 170, 58th Congress. 2d Session. David H. Doherty, M. D.

A Definite Policy. Leaflet. Letter to Boston Transcript. David Greene Haskins, Jr., March 24, 1904.

Our Country. Leaflet. Address before the Iroquois Club of Chicago. Gen. Nelson A. Miles. April 13, 1904.

Hush, Hush, Don't Mention Freedom. Leaflet.

No Jury Trial for Americans in the Philippines. Leaflet.

Cost of War and Warfare. Broadside. Edward Atkinson. July, 1904.

Cost of War and Warfare. The same abridged. Edward Atkinson. July, 1904.

The Democratic Philippine Plank. Leaflet.

To the Independent Voter. An open letter. Carl Schurz.

Constitutional Democracy vs. Imperialism. Leaflet.

Neutralization. A policy by which any responsibility incurred by the United States in the Philippine Islands may be discharged. Leaflet, condensed from a paper read before the Thirteenth International Peace Congress. Erving Winslow.

Anti-Imperialism the Great Issue. Addresses. The Hon. Charles R. Codman and Mr. Henry W. Hardon. Reply. Hon. Alton B. Parker. October 15, 1904.

We have used mailing lists, the services of friends in many parts of the country, in some cases distribution by hand at offices and stores and at public meetings in various places. The demand from scholars in educational establishments and members of debating clubs of all kinds for documents as materials for debates has continued. It has been the custom to ask the participants in these debates to report the result and it is interesting to note how almost unanimously the decision has been in favor of the abandonment of the Philippine Islands, the form which the positive of the question usually takes.

At the luncheon, November 30th, 1903, at the Twentieth Century Club, which followed the adjourned meeting of the League, addresses were made by the Hon. Winslow Warren, Prof. William James, the Hon. George S. Boutwell, Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, the Hon. George E. McNeill, the Rev. R. E. Bisbee, the Rev. Charles Gordon Ames and the Rev. Charles W. Wendte, and these speeches and addresses were published in the Annual Report.

On the 21st of April, 1904, a luncheon was given at the Twentieth Century Club which was addressed by the Hon. George S. Boutwell, the Rev. Dr. A. A. Berle, the Hon. A. A. Putnam, Prof. Homer B. Sprague, Mr. Martin L. Travieso and a poem was read by Mr. William Roscoe Thayer, "A Son's Appeal to America."

A meeting of Anti-Imperialists was held in St. Louis, July 6th, in which New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio and Oregon were represented. A committee of three delegates, one each from Oregon, Illinois and Massachusetts, was appointed to wait on the committee of resolutions of the Democratic Convention to urge upon the committee the adoption of a submitted plank for the platform, referring to the petition for Philippine independence which had been presented through the hands of the Hon. Charles A. Towne. The committee was the first one heard by the full committee on resolutions. It was listened to with respect and the plank was substantially adopted.

On the first of August, 1904, a large and enthusiastic meeting was held in Faneuil Hall to commend the Philippine plank of the Democratic National Platform. This meeting was presided over by the Hon. George S. Boutwell, who made a speech, and it was addressed by the Hon. L. F. C. Garvin, the Hon. Charles Francis Adams and the Hon. W. Bourke Cockran.

Two vice presidents of the New England Anti-Imperialist League have died during the year. Dr. E. Winchester Donald had been one of its most consistent, vigorous and outspoken supporters and from his noble character and his very important position his influence was wide and valuable. His words and deeds of helpfulness and sympathy were a constant encouragement to the officials of the League and he will be missed from its counsels.

The Hon. Henry Brewer Metcalf, next to the cause which was with him paramount to all others, believed in Anti-Imperialism with all the energy of his vivid, earnest nature. He was a generous giver to the League of time and money. His place can scarcely be supplied.

There have been irreparable breaches in the ranks of our supporters. Henry C. Weston, Joseph A. Allen, Amos W. Stetson, James Munson Barnard, Abby Morton Diaz, George H. Munroe, Nathan B. Prescott, should be remembered here with respect and gratitude.

It would seem that historical investigations in defence of our position had been exhaustive, but a most interesting parallel has only lately been unearthed by Mr. Henry W. Hardon to the relations between the Philippine Republic and the United States at the time the treaty negotiated by the United States with Spain at the conclusion of the Spanish War was ratified. After the thirteen colonies had taken up arms, the King of Spain declared war against England, assisted the colonies with a loan of money, and sent his troops into what was then the Colony of Georgia. At the conclusion of the war these troops held part of the territory of that colony and for some years continued to hold it in spite of the remonstrance of the United States. The King of Spain insisted that, having acquired that territory by force of arms, and never having recognized the independence of the United States, he was entitled to retain it. Our situation in the Philippines as fully stated in Senate Document 62 was so similar that the arguments of Washington, Jefferson and Pinckney, which were effectual in causing the relinquishment of the Spanish claims and the withdrawal of her forces, might have been appropriately employed by the Filipinos in remonstrance with the government of the United States.

"A war existing between two nations as Spain and Great Britain could give to neither the right to seize and appropriate the territory of a third which is neutral, much less (of one) which is an associate in the war, as the United States were with Spain . . . . .

Spain was bound to deliver the posts in Georgia to the United States as the successor to the title of Great Britain, but she was also bound to do so by the law of nations on a much stronger ground, as (the United States were) the real and only proprietors of those places which she (Spain) had taken possession of in a moment of danger without having had any cause of war with the United States, and without having declared any; but, on the contrary, conducting herself in other respects as a friend and associate."

How is it possible to avoid condemnation of the insincerity which has denied within a decade the application of those rules of international law to which we appealed a century ago?

At the last general Anti-Imperialist Conference a committee was appointed for the promotion of the general purposes of the Anti-Imperialist cause and this committee authorized last

month the publication of an abridgement of a report on Philippine conditions made by Prof. H. Parker Willis, who has recently returned from a four months' sojourn in the Islands. Prof. Willis, who has been connected with Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., wrote: "I stand personally for the statements I make. I have verified the details of this paper so far as now possible. There may be errors of detail as there may be in the work of any one, though I trust not, but of the essential correctness of the picture there can, I believe, be no doubt."

Messrs. Moorfield Storey, Charles Francis Adams, Carl Schurz, Edwin Burritt Smith and Herbert Welsh of the committee state that Prof. Willis has "had exceptional opportunities for ascertaining the truth. For his entire honesty, his skill as a trained investigator, his judgment in weighing evidence and his reliability as a witness we vouch."

This report was not primarily intended for political use. Prof. Willis's investigations are embodied in an extended report which will probably be published soon in book form. Their condensation in the letter submitted to the committee was printed in full only in the New York Evening Post of October 28th last. It was alluded to by the Democratic candidate for the Presidency and it has been superficially attacked by representatives of the Administration. The report when presented in full must have a great effect in enlightening the public of the United States as to the true condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands. The summary of Mr. Willis's letter is as follows: "We have in fact destroyed the public buildings of the country, inflicted continuous crop losses during a period of six years, ravaged and burned large sections of territory, produced conditions leading to the death of most of the farm animals and to serious human and animal epidemics, brought foreign trade to an unprofitable condition by our tariff legislation, inaugurated a tremendously expensive government for the benefit of foreign office holders, established a partisan judiciary, crowded the prisons and deported or sent to the gallows the best and most patriotic of the native leaders."

It is impossible to avoid an allusion here to the confirmatory evidence afforded by two recent critics from an entirely independent standpoint. Mr. John Foreman, in his paper in the September number of the Contemporary Review, stamps our experiment as an absolute failure. Mr. Alleyne Ireland, who

has recently returned from the Philippine Islands as an impartial student of the conditions, sees no logical hope because of the lack of power and opportunity in the United States to carry on a genuinely imperial form of colonial government. So long as we continue in form a republic, criminal as our attempt at imperialism may be, it can but be a pinchbeck article in the eyes of those trained and experienced observers who know that an absolute autocracy and the employment of coolie labor are the only means of getting real profit from the outlying possessions. Unless the whole subject be forgotten, and against that possibility the Anti-Imperialist League pledges itself persistently to strive, the knowledge of the truth will be the best argument for our cause, and sooner or later knowledge of the truth the American public must have.

We hope now to unite in hearty co-operation all those citizens of the United States who believe in Philippine independence and thus to employ every method by which it may be attained. Action to bring about this end must be in the last resort political action. Our campaign of education welcoming every means of influencing action is unpartisan. Those of our friends who believe that Republican sentiment can be moulded and directed toward its attainment are free to exert what power they possess in this direction. Those who belong to parties which are out of office can see to it that the programme that we advocate is still the programme for them, awaiting opportunities for its promotion, and the independents who belong to no party will be found, we are assured, largely ready to act with us in extending the knowledge of the situation and of the principles for which we contend. No one has ever determined the relative proportions between the leaven and the lump which it is finally to leaven. The process is a silent one and the results are often sudden and unexpected.

Meanwhile let us take to heart some timely and inspiring words, though not primarily addressed to us the other day: "I wish to see . . . . . the determination not to shrink back when temporarily beaten in life, as each one will be now and then, but to come up again, and wrest triumph from defeat."—Theodore Roosevelt.

ERVING WINSLOW, Secretary.

TREASURER'S REPORT.

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE IN ACCOUNT WITH
DAVID G. HASKINS, JR., TREASURER.

Dr.

To amounts expended from November 30, 1903, to November 26, 1904, inclusive, viz.:	
For Postage, Express, Messengers	$1636.44
" Typewriting, Copying, Use of Typewriter etc.	835.51
" Printing, etc.	618.45
" Expenses of Meetings and Travelling . .	255.15
" Addressing and Forwarding Literature .	75.55
" Translating, Congressional Information Bureau	37.35
" Stationery, Telegraph and Sundries . .	371.46
" Balance on hand November 26, 1904 . .	174.55
	$4004.46

Cr.

By Balance on hand November 29, 1903. . ..	$ 201.33
" Contributions in response to special appeal of May 17, 1904.	423.00
" All other Contributions	2713.75
" Membership Fees and Annual Dues . .	580.50
" Metal used in old publications sold to Cambridge Chronicle	85.00
" Interest, New England Trust Company .	.88
	$4004.46

E. and O. E.

DAVID G. HASKINS, JR., *Treasurer.*
November 26, 1904.

BOSTON, November 28, 1904.

I hereby certify that I have examined the accounts of David G. Haskins, Jr., as treasurer of the Anti-Imperialist League for the year ending November 26, 1904, that I have found them properly vouched and correctly cast, and that his cash balance on hand is $174.55.

FRANCIS A. OSBORN.

In presenting this financial report for the sixth year of the League's work, the Treasurer has again the grateful duty of expressing, on behalf of the members of the Executive Committee, the warmest appreciation of the splendid self-sacrificing devotion to American ideals of the many earnest men and women,—members of the League and friends of the cause,—whose loyal support has never faltered. Their liberal and repeated contributions,—ranging from the widow's mite to the hundred dollar check; their touching letters; their earnest words of sympathy, have been a constant encouragement and inspiration. With such convincing evidences before him,—whatever others might say in moments of discouragement,—he who has the happiness to be the Treasurer of this League could not, even if he tried, be a pessimist, nor allow himself for a moment to believe that our national ideals have perished from the earth.

And now, what of the future? That is for the League to determine; but I cannot but think the answer may be read in those same letters and messages of the past years. Anti-Imperialism is an immortal principle. It is, we believe, the application of Christianity to international affairs;—of the principles of true democracy to our dealings with other peoples. It is justice as opposed to the spirit of conquest, or to an unscrupulous missionary zeal. When justice controls all our national policy towards the weaker and less fortunate peoples the League may go out of business. When the Golden Rule is repealed and the Declaration of Independence is struck from our records,—it must disband. But today it has a message for the country; a work of education to perform, as necessary for the American people as for the Filipinos. The method of doing that work may vary from time to time, with changing conditions. But the League cannot rest. With moderation and fairness, with unshaken confidence in the moral soundness of the American people, it must make its earnest appeal to their judgment, their conscience, and their heart. Patiently it must seek to convince them of the folly, expense and wrong involved in the present un-American craze for imitating European colonialism. It must make them realize that justice is even higher than benevolence, that the Golden Rule applies to nations as well as to individuals; and that we are violating it every day in the Philippines.

It should seize every opportunity to spread information; to

encourage discussions and joint debates; and to keep the question constantly before the people. It should continue its successful efforts to promote a knowledge of the subject in our schools and colleges,—among the voters of the near future. It should carefully watch the proceedings of Congress, and use all its influence against legislation tending to connect the Philippines more closely with this country. And it should steadily and without a shadow of compromise maintain, in the sight of all men, its lofty standard, constantly demanding an immediate promise of early independence for the Islands.

All can help,—even the quietest and least influential member of the League,—in shaping public opinion. Your committee are ready and anxious to continue the work with energy and enthusiasm. But money is needed, of course. We have less than $200 in the treasury. In saying this the Treasurer is painfully aware that the principal burden of carrying on the work for several past years has rested on comparatively few devoted friends of the cause. Others, who also sympathize with the object, ought to share this burden. The committee have endeavored to devise means to this end; and practical suggestions as to methods of raising money in the new year are urgently requested.

The Anti-Imperialist League will continue its work, with full confidence of ultimate success. The defeat in an election of a political party that has bravely and, I believe, honestly, advocated our principles is regrettable, but it is a mere passing incident.

Our lack of members need not discourage us. The Abolitionists were few; but slavery perished. Victory will come, and it may be nearer than we think. Wendell Phillips is said to have predicted, shortly before the Civil War, that no man then living would see the end of slavery. Washington and his band of indomitable patriots would have exulted if, amidst the discouragements and hardships of Valley Forge, they could have look forward to the crowning triumph of Yorktown, less than the space of one Presidential term in the future.

"Have you struck?" demanded the English captain in the midst of John Paul Jones's desperate sea fight, when, for a moment the murderous cannonade had ceased. "I have not begun to fight," was Jones's proud reply. And he won, against great odds.

DAVID G. HASKINS, JR., Treasurer.

The Secretary reported recommending changes in the Constitution as follows:

The Executive Committee suggests that article one shall be struck out from the Constitution. The article reads:

"This organization shall be known as the New England Anti-Imperialist League. It shall be enrolled as a member of and shall co-operate with the American Anti-Imperialist League," and that a new article be adopted as follows:

"This organization shall be known as the Anti-Imperialist League."

That article two, which now reads: "This League is organized to aid in holding the United States true to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. It seeks the preservation of the rights of the people as guaranteed to them by the Constitution. Its members hold self-government to be fundamental and good government but incidental. It is its purpose to oppose by all proper means the extension of the sovereignty of the United States over subject peoples. It will withhold its support from any candidate or party that stands for the forcible subjugation of any people,"—

shall be struck out and the following article substituted for it:

"This League was organized to aid in holding the United States true to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. It believes that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and holds self-government to be fundamental and good government but incidental. It demands for all people under the United States government the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Its object is by all proper means to oppose as inconsistent with American ideals the forcible extension of the sovereignty of the United States over foreign peoples and in particular to work constantly for the early and complete independence of the Philippine Islands."

That article five, which now reads:

"The Executive Committee may contribute a fair proportion of the funds of the League to the support of the general work of the American Anti-Imperialist League,"

shall be struck out.

The proposed changes were unanimously adopted.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

On motion a committee consisting of Mr. James H. Bow-

ditch and Mr. H. A. Carson was appointed by the chair to collect and count ballots for officers for the ensuing year, and having performed this duty reported that the following gentlemen were elected:

PRESIDENT

GEORGE S. BOUTWELL

TREASURER

DAVID GREENE HASKINS, JR.

SECRETARY

ERVING WINSLOW

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CHARLES GORDON AMES
GAMALIEL BRADFORD
JULIAN CODMAN
PATRICK A. COLLINS
C. F. DOLE
CHARLES FLEISCHER
WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON
EDWIN GINN
GEORGE E. McNEILL
ALBERT S. PARSONS
ALBION A. PERRY
A. A. PUTNAM
JOSIAH QUINCY
JOHN RITCHIE
FRANK B. SANBORN
CHARLES WARREN
FISKE WARREN

VICE-PRESIDENTS

CONNECTICUT
HENRY WADE ROGERS
WILLIAM G. SUMNER
CHARLES F. THAYER

ILLINOIS
EDWIN BURRITT SMITH

MAINE
SETH C. GORDON
LUTHER F. McKINNEY

MASSACHUSETTS
EDWARD ATKINSON
LEONARD W. BACON
SAMUEL BOWLES
D. H. CHAMBERLAIN
CHARLES R. CODMAN
DANA ESTES
G. STANLEY HALL
WILLIAM JAMES
HENRY W. LAMB
EDWIN D. MEAD
ROBERT M. MORSE
JAMES P. MUNROE
CHARLES ELIOT NORTON
FRANCIS A. OSBORN
HENRY PICKERING
MOORFIELD STOREY
WINSLOW WARREN

NEW HAMPSHIRE
HENRY F. HOLLIS

NEW YORK
EVERETT V. ABBOTT
CHARLES STEWART DAVISON
LOUIS R. EHRICH
PATRICK FORD
WILLIAM R. HUNTINGTON
MRS. CHARLES RUSSELL LOWELL

PENNSYLVANIA
HERBERT WELSH
W. HORACE HOSKINS

WISCONSIN
WILLIAM GEORGE BRUCE

RHODE ISLAND
EDWIN C. PIERCE
W. N. McVICKAR

TEXAS
JAMES L. SLAYDEN

VERMONT
A. P. CHILDS
A. C. A. HALL

WYOMING
JOHN C. HAMM

REMARKS BY MR. WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

I confess to a relief that the political campaign is ended and that, as anti-imperialists, we meet again upon our strongest ground, which is the moral one. Eager as we are for a party change in our direction, we, like all associations based on an ethical truth, are least effective in the heat of elections.

It is then that numbers count, and the numerical strengh of our organization is as yet a future asset. It is the false majority of present figures only that politicians respect. They have no eyes to see that one with right upon his side is the real majority and shapes events to come. For, against the right what shall permanently prevail!

How transitory is political success! How unstable and unreasoning seem the many headed people. Like ocean tides opinions ebb and flow. The deluge which has overtaken one party this year will in due time be followed by another to engulf the victors.

"Wait a little; do we not wait?
William McKinley was not Fate,
Theodore Roosevelt is not Time;
There's One hath swifter feet than Crime;
Cannon—congresses settle naught;
Ours Manila—whose is Thought?
Minie is good, but, spite of change
Gutenberg's gun has the longest range."

While we keep the long-range gun of free speech the victory, howe'er delayed, is never doubtful. So we are justified in meeting today with cheer and jubilation, confident that the apparent misfortune of the present is the assured pledge of future triumph. After six years of struggle against the swelling pride of Anglo-Saxon self-consciousness, its lust of power and greed, what inventory can the anti-imperialists show?

A few of the original articles are missing, but in their place have been added many of greater worth. We have parted with that buoyant confidence in the nation's speedy return to its ideals. We had not comprehended the extent of Democracy's dry rot. We held the faith of the early abolitionists, that it was only necessary to expose a great iniquity and the people would hasten to erase it. We misconceived the situation. I hardly know what other belief we have discarded; it is easier to name what we have gained. We know at least where we

stand and what imponderable opposition we face. The Spanish War was the touchstone which banished illusions and showed us what tyrannic instincts can lurk in democratic breasts.

Among our gains we may count as a solid credential the unwilling acknowledgement of our accurate predictions by apologetic soldiers and statesmen. They verify the existence of the dangers against which this League warned the country at the outset. After the capture of Manila we were assured that the event having happened closed all discussion. It was never so wide open as now. When by brute force and cruelty the slender troops of the Filipino patriots were crushed, we were promised the spectacle of a happy and united people kissing the hand that smote them. The records of the government are now forced to portray the unreconciled spirit and hearty hatred of the subjugated people.

We have surmounted the barriers to free speech. The threats of punishment for treason have ceased. Plain language is no longer a luxury, but is indulged in by the anti-imperialist as human nature's daily food. The aggressor has turned apologist and is forced to defend himself against himself. Guilt is its own accuser, made cowardly by conscience.

It has been joyful to see officials who would silence by law the Administration's critics themselves become helplessly incontinent of speech on the forbidden theme. We sit dumb with astonishment amidst the clamor of self-justification from jingo lips. Nothing is settled. The discussion is broadcast. The ugly fact compels debate until justice and independence in the Philippines bring the only possible finality.

It is a striking development, this disturbance created by a handful of politically uninfluential men and women, of which this League is the nucleus. They have no party to execute commands; no gifts to bestow; they rely solely upon the power of truth and the righteousness of a just cause. Yet they occupy the thoughts and minds of the empire makers in greater proportion than all other opposing forces. We cannot read a speech from either one of the scholarly triumvirate of liberty's betrayers, Taft, Root and Hay, without perceiving that their sorest feelings and bitterest epigrams are prompted by the vision of Boston's jury of arraignment. They cannot bear the name of Aristides. Every sneer at Edward Atkinson or Governor Boutwell or Moorfield Storey or Erving Winslow is a tribute to the virtue of courage and plain speech. The

politician can be placated, the self-seeker rewarded, but the apostle of truth knows no compromise and demands the ultimate. Against his appeal to justice they have no weapons in their brutal arsenal.

As the commercial promises of the government have proved false,—as the imprisoned Islands grow more and more a burden to the captor,—as the American people, wearied by the horrors of slaughter, are looking, at least sentimentally, towards peace,—the tide is turning in our direction. It brings with it, however, some jetsam and flotsam not worth rescuing from the waters. The temptation is offered us to make use of certain colonial experts fresh from the Philippines, who reveal the stupidity of our government in ruling subject races. To that extent they help to heap confusion on the responsible parties, but,—avowed imperialists, and callous to human rights, —we have no basis of union with them.

Thank heaven that free government is a wretched school for pro-consuls and turns out only bungling petty despots. "Bad kings and governors help us, if they are only bad enough," said Emerson. We have no wish to see tyranny made more secure or less trying by skilful methods introduced into our colonies. The very word colonies should be enough to stir the blood of the people of Washington and Lincoln, for the corollary of colony is slave, and imperialism means slavery and nothing else. "System for all, and rights for none," is the commercial cry. We pray for clumsiness, not skill. Good roads, pure water and ample docks are a poor exchange for independence.

> "Better to dwell in Freedom's Hall
> With the cold damp floor and the mouldering wall,
> Than to bow the head and bend the knee
> In the proudest palace of slavery."

I desire to express my gratitude for that universal law which makes the powerful of the earth feeble in the presence of the seemingly weak champions of truth. It is happiness to be in association with bodies like this, whose strongest bond is an ideal one. Mordecai at the gate is more potent than the king within the palace.

For a closing sentiment let me borrow that ever memorable one of Wendell Phillips:—"The broadest and most far-sighted intellect is utterly unable to forsee the ultimate consequences of any great social change. Ask yourself, on all such occasions,

if there be any element of right and wrong in the question, any principle of clear natural justice that turns the scale. If so, take your part with the perfect and abstract right, and trust to God that it shall prove the expedient."

REMARKS BY THE REV. A. A. BERLE, D. D.

We stand today apparently in the shadow of a great defeat. It is neither good sense nor loyalty to truth to attempt to deny it or to flinch in the face of it. The most impressive and striking representative of the personal idea in government that has arisen in the history of America has swept the whole nation before him and is today the unchallenged master of the destinies of America. A ponderous and willing majority in Congress stands ready to obey the dictates of the leader of the party in the White House. A demoralized and utterly discredited opposition party cowers in his presence, while some of its leaders hasten to get under the protecting wing of the Administration, accepting consolation offices as the price of principles abandoned. It does not become us to challenge the will of the American people. They have spoken and they have spoken unmistakeably. Theodore Roosevelt represents today the temper and the point of view of the American people, as to armies, navies, world power, Panama republics and American police duty on the Western hemisphere. That is as undeniable as the rising of the sun. What then?

First, majorities have never created righteousness and the overwhelming abandonment of the fundamental principles of constitutionalism has usually been followed by as clear and overwhelming a recognition of that abandonment. If it seems like presumption to claim that the American people are overwhelmingly mistaken in this matter, it is no greater presumption that is involved in every effort to reform society nor as great as was manifested by those who sought to overthrow vested feudal rights and lay the foundations of popular liberty in the ages past. Righteousness has never been a matter of majorities. Else, why the long list of martyrs who have been stoned in their day only to have costly memorials built to them when the passion-ridden masses have recognized too late that they were right. Our position today in the face of a 2,000,000 popular majority for the President as the represen-

tative of military power and imperial development of the land is by no means as courageous or as daring as that of the noble company who are at this moment pleading for wider popular liberty in the Russian Empire. Were mine the only voice to lift this standard it should still be raised. Nor would we dare to claim for ourselves superior virtue or superior courage. The cry of the Filipino will not be hushed in this overwhelming vote for imperialism. If righteousness had been a matter of majorities, however large, the Gospel would long since have ceased to be.

Secondly, it must be kept in mind that the President himself has before him a unique situation and obligation. Let us not forget that he is an American. There are some of us here today who can remember the thrill of hope which educated young Americans throughout the land had when Henry Cabot Lodge appeared on the horizon of American political life, and when under the glow of that rising sun of our hopes we dedicated our lives to the ideal life for the Republic. I well remember such a company of twenty of whom I was one. What matters it that we were betrayed! What matters it that we saw the ideal leader of our hopes become the worst and most discreditable machine politician of them all. What matters it that we saw the name of "scholar in politics" become a byword and a hissing. We were Americans. We found that each man must bear his own burden. We found that love for the land of our birth and loyalty to her ideal life was something vaster than could be bounded in any representative individual. President Roosevelt is an American. If ever a man could break with freedom and without shame the shackles of party restraint, he can do it. If ever a man could say to the Addickses, the Platts and the rest of the disreputable managers of a corrupt machine, "I have no need of you," it is he. Why may we not dare to hope that America will be greater to him than party and that the ideals of his youth may reassert themselves in this hour of his own peculiar triumph? But what if they do not? We shall still be Americans. The Declaration of Independence has not been wiped off the hearts and memories of Americans. The Farewell Address of Washington is still a classic of American wisdom and statesmanship.

They only will be discouraged and faint hearted to whom these principles which we have advocated have been grounded upon the mere basis of political expediency and to whom

success only is righteousness. It does not become us to whine or repine. There are no weaklings here. The political lines are breaking and the voice of the independent is heard in the land. If we seem to be in an eclipse, let us remember that the dark ages were followed by the renaissance. If we are overshadowed, what seem to us the ugly monsters of rapacity and greed, who grow daily stronger while the burdens of the masses of the people grow heavier, let us remember that those who first lifted up their voices against the intrenched evils of slavery and other colossal sins did not fail in the end. "Rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation, continuing instant in prayer" is the text of the hour, but you observe it begins with rejoicing in hope. Some of us are old enough to remember the campaigns of the early days of national inspiration and reform. Some of us, let us hope, are young enough to live through the night of imperialistic glory and bombast, and rise with the birds on the morning of a great deliverance and a new definition of the rights of man.

REMARKS BY MR. FRANK B. SANBORN.

I do not agree with Dr. Berle in his remarks about a great defeat. We have our consolations in Governor Douglas. One of my friends had a domestic who had not been with her very long, but who was very satisfactory. Suddenly the domestic gave notice that she must leave, and the mistress said: "Why, Bridget, I thought we were getting along very well. I like you and I thought you liked us." And then Bridget said: "Oh, yes, 'tis a good place,—but it's to be married I am." The mistress said: "Why, how is that? I have never seen any friend of yours here." To which Bridget replied, "O, no; but you'll remember, about three weeks ago, I went to my third cousin's funeral, and coming back from the grave her husband said, 'Bridget, I hope I shall see ye often, for ye're the charm of the funeral to me'." Douglas is our Bridget. One word about the defeat of imperialism in Massachusetts. It is perfectly demonstrated by figures that the cause of anti-imperialism in Massachusetts has triumphed by at least 75,000 majority. Our candidate for governor, Mr. Douglas, has received a majority of about 36,000. He was a pronounced Anti-Imperialist, and went round making speeches to that effect. Mr.

McCall in his Congressional district was another Anti-Imperialist, and he ran about 3,000 ahead of Mr. Roosevelt. There were other members of Congress elected who were also Anti-Imperialists. Put these figures together and you will find that the 80,000 plurality of Roosevelt does not represent imperialism at all, but it represents that uncertain state of mind such as people get into when they have made a bad bargain and don't know what to do with it. They are in the position of a family who have a daughter unfortunately married,—they don't like to speak about it. That is the trouble with the Republicans and imperialism. They want to get a divorce for this daughter, but they don't want us to remind them of the situation.

Now for my speech on "Unchangeable Truths."

If there were not presumably advantages and benefits in a creed which does not change its form every Sunday, or even once a year, it is hardly to be supposed that so many millions of our race would adopt and recite a creed week after week. They are not all alike, and there is not much hope that they ever will be; there are many good creeds, and some bad ones; but in political affairs there are certain fixed principles that govern the form of creeds. The monarchist believes in a king, and usually in hereditary succession; the aristocrat believes in the rule of the few; the democrat in the competence of the many to designate the few who shall exercise temporary rule over the many. The imperialist believes in empire over widely distant regions; in power emanating from a centre, and all the more autocratic the farther from that centre it is to be exercised. The difference between the American imperialist and the same theorist in other lands is that he professes to believe in the democratic principles, but insists on putting it into practice in the oligarchic or despotic form. The European imperialist is a monarchist, or an aristocrat; for empire requires autocratic power, supported by oligarchic institutions. The American imperialist does not aim consciously at autocracy on the model of Russia; he would be very sorry to find himself subject to such an autocrat; but he believes himself to be one of an aristocracy, entitled by some mysterious endowment of nature to govern others, or at least to tell other folks when they are capable of governing themselves. He assumes to have some exalted wisdom or some latent gift by which he can decide when a man of another country or another race has the capacity for self-government; and he talks about it glibly,

as if it were as easy as measuring a man for a garment, or testing a boy's eyes for near-sighted glasses. When he undertakes to govern others, however,—as, for instance, in the South after reconstruction, or in the Philippines after forcible annexation (which, by the standard of the late Mr. McKinley was criminal aggression), he finds that he has not the imagined endowment for the purpose. The carpet-bag governments at the South have very few defenders now; and the benevolent assimilators of the Filipinos will have as few imitators, five years hence, as the discredited administrators of the rebellious States have at present in this country. The Philippine satraps and publicans, exploiters of resources and instructors in government, are repeating, with hardly any improvement, and with little benefit from experience, the honest mistakes and imbecile blunders of the precursors of self-government in Carolina, Alabama and Louisiana, during the administrations of Johnson and Grant. Now we must keep reciting our own creed; and it is short and simple, though the Philippine problem is by no means simple, and its solution will be anything but short. It is this,—that a democratic, federal republic cannot have subject colonies, any more than it can have an hereditary monarch. The thing is a contradiction in terms, like a square circle, or a sky-blue scarlet shawl. Every democracy that has tried the experiment has either lost its colonies or its democratic constitution. Instead of subject colonies our constitution requires territories in preparation for states, in the great federation which our fathers planned, and to which their children adhered until the short-sighted, unthinking imperialists, six years ago, stumbled into the Philippine blunder. No doubt many of the people who thought of the future at all supposed at first that States of our Union could be made out of the far-away Philippine archipelago. That supposition is no longer tenable. The clause in our Constitution which requires the nation to guarantee to each State a republican form of government would impose upon us, if there were a single Philippine State, an outlay for army and navy as great as would be required to hold the Islands in military subjection. Nor is military subjection any longer really thought of except by officers of the army and navy. In fact, the present situation is one of anxious waiting for something to turn up that will relieve the United States of the burden it has assumed when the prayerful McKinley said he followed the will of God and the blind

impulse of destiny, and called upon our Filipino allies to yield unqualified submission to a power that had not then even a bargain-counter right to their allegiance. And the Boston Congregationalist told us we must not dispute the wisdom of McKinley, because he was so "near the mind of God." Now if that were true at all, it was an unchangeable truth; for God, by any definition, does not change his mind.

Nor have we, as opponents of the indescribable foolishness of forcible annexation in the Philippines, any occasion to change our minds. We hold certain unchangeable truths,—not only those which Dr. Holmes laid down seventy years ago, when he was beginning to make himself known as a comic poet, and which are still true,—

Boston isn't in Bengal;
Flannel drawers aren't made of tripe;
Lobsters wear no specs at all,
And cows don't smoke the German pipe;

but other and more serious truths, like, "All men are created equal," "Might does not make right," "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." (Unjust powers, of course, may be invented by persons fancying themselves to be as "near the mind of God" as they are really far from it.) A majority of millions at an election does not make moral axioms false, nor vitiate our creed in the slightest degree. We must keep repeating it, as Cato did his Roman creed, "Carthage must be destroyed." If we need a chant to go with it, let us sing,

For what avail
The plow or sail,
Or land or life, if Freedom fail?

REMARKS BY THE HON. A. A. PUTNAM.

I never felt more like meeting with the Anti-Imperialist League than now—now that the election is over and the returns are received and respectfully considered. At first view, the returns might seem a loud signal for the League to wind up its business, close its doors and burn its records. Words to that effect have been said and written—written in large letters. But that is not the view of Anti-Imperialists. On the contrary, I trust that we were never more earnest in

our cause than today—today when the Republic seems hopelessly set in the direction of empire. Apparently it is doomed to a term of imperial presidency fatal to its republican life. If ever the opponents of such a presidency had cause to feel discouraged, now would seem to be the time. But we are not discouraged. We are not even disturbed in the chambers of our judgment, for we know the rock we stand on. Standing as we do, we know that the gates of hell shall not prevail against us. Hence we do not lower our colors one inch. We couldn't if we would. They are nailed to the mast, and there will fly.

In the words of Garrison, we will not retract, we will not retreat and we will be heard. In a large sense we are stronger in Massachusetts now than ever before since the United States army went forth to crush an infant republic and subjugate a liberty-aspiring people—a people who, as Mr. Hoar said, were ready to kiss the very hems of our garments, so did they build their hope on our help. Yes, stronger than ever. At the dawn of the new year the old Bay State will have for its head an Anti-Imperialist. Only think of that! Its capital city has one now of splendid type, and Gov. Boutwell still survives in all his vigor to head the Anti-Imperialist League of New England.

The number of Anti-Imperialists is not less since Nov. 8th, but more—just as the number of anti-slavery men and women was more after the election of James Buchanan. We shall yet have another "bleeding Kansas," another "Lecompton Constitution" and the "border ruffianism" of rough riderism to rouse the country. Great victories are sometimes great defeats, even as defeats are sometimes great victories.

God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform.

So let us keep our armor girded on, replenish our ammunition, watch the enemy, and be ready to blaze away. Our paper shots have all along been telling. No better evidence of it than the squirming on the Republican stump all through the late campaign—a campaign spotted on that side by a spectacle never seen before—a whole cabinet rushing from Washington to stump the States and defend the policy of imperialism, at the same time protesting that there was nothing to defend. Never did administration before so betray its conscious weakness. But we did not need the betrayal to satisfy us of its weakness. We have known from the start that it had not a solitary inch of

moral ground to stand upon for defence or argument. As for the argument, it has never argued, but only denied, misrepresented and suppressed so far as it could the horrible truth, for the existence of which it alone is responsible. So I say, All hail to the battle that is before us to wage. Gaudet certamine virtus. The sling of freedom and the pebble of justice is on our side, and sooner or later the stalking Goliath shall totter and fall.

REMARKS BY THE REV. CHAS. GORDON AMES.

This is a very cheerful sort of a "funeral,"—even if we make it an occasion for retrospect. I suppose we have all been obliged, more than once, to review our own course of conduct, especially when the wisdom or rectitude of our part in public affairs has been called in question by those excellent people from whom we have differed. Over and over again we ask, were we right? We are made to look backward as well as forward; else why these hinges in our necks?

> "Truth comes to us with slow and doubtful step;
> Measuring the ground she treads on; ever and anon
> Turning her curious eye to see that all
> Is right behind; and then, with keen survey,
> Choosing her onward path."

Well, in taking this careful retrospect, I cannot see one important step which we would not take again. Our main contention has covered three points: (1.) That the course of the government of the United States toward the Philippines was a "criminal aggression" upon the rights of the Islanders. We must say it still. (2.) That it was injurious and burdensome to our own people—a bloody blunder of national policy, threatening long and sad mischief to our country. We must say it still. (3.) That it was in gross violation of the principles of free government—the principles by which we defend our own personal and public liberties. We must say it still.

The events of five or six years have brought cumulative proofs that we were right; and uncounted millions who still denounce us as traitors and ridicule us as "Little Americans" have an odd way of regretting that this Philippine business

was ever undertaken, while in the next breath they praise Providence for thus making us "a world power." Would not every man of them fight to the death against such an invasion of rights and subjugation to a foreign authority as we have enforced upon the Filipino people? Would not every one of them have resisted, as the Filipinos have resisted till overpowered, and appealed, as they have vainly appealed, to our own historical declaration?

The method of imperial colonialism, by which sovereignty over whole populations is bought and sold with their land, without asking their consent and against their will, though often practised by the strong modern nations, has well been called "a continuance of the traffic in slaves." Ex-President Harrison, in one of his latest public utterances, said in substance that any people who could exercise natural and political rights only by the allowance of a foreign authority were in a state of slavery.

Holding these truths to be self-evident, we have affirmed them through good and evil report, as a duty of loyalty to our own country and to mankind. How could we innocently and honorably be silent when the whole power of the Republic, with the consent of Congress, is gathered into the hands of the President and applied to the control of seven or eight millions of distant people? Whether that power is used with humanity or cruelty, it is and must be a despotic usurpation over those who have been disarmed and rendered helpless. And we have heard and heeded an ancient injunction which unites justice with mercy:—"Open thy mouth for the dumb."

In this sober review of our course we find one comfort which can hardly be shared by some who reproach us: The blood of our brethren is not on our hands or our consciences. We have earnestly protested, not only against the wholesale slaughter of "the little brown people" in what an American general called "a rabbit hunt"; we have also protested against the needless waste of thousands of lives of our brave soldiers, some of whom expressed their abhorrence of such inglorious service.

We have indeed been accused of prolonging the native resistance by "a fire in the rear." How could we forget that George the Third brought the same bitter and plausible charge against the English friends of American Independence? We have thought the responsibility for bloodshed lay at the doors of those who sent more than tens of thousands of soldiers across

the Pacific to enforce our succession to the hateful Spanish domination.

It is an unspeakable grief that no future Memorial Day orator can ever apply to our heroes, sacrificed to extinguish freedom, the strong and tender words with which Lincoln consecrated the Gettysburg graves: "From these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion, ... that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth." The Island patriots who have so promptly appealed to the "self-evident truths" of our immortal Declaration may well pronounce these other words above the trenches into which we have heaped the corpses of their nation's willing martyrs.

We have been reproached as a pestiferous swarm of stinging insects, hanging on the flanks of the government and army only to obstruct and annoy,—incapable of originating or appreciating any positive constructive method of dealing with a difficult situation. So far is this from the truth that I believe the Anti-Imperialists have been almost alone in formulating and urging a line of policy consistent with national honor and duty. At our first meeting in Faneuil Hall, in May, 1898, while the boom of Dewey's guns was ringing in our ears, I ventured to suggest a "protectorate,"—a word that held the germ of the policy afterward adopted in dealing with Cuba, and urged upon the government by Senator Hoar and other sober statesmen as the solution of the troublesome Philippine problem.

The combined political, commercial, military and religious forces have proved too much for us. But though hand join in hand, it is certain that nations, like individuals, must reap as they sow. The end is not yet. Personally I have not been hopeful that some of us older fellows would live to see the nation do works meet for repentance. Yet here we stand; we cannot do otherwise. Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, we stand for the good old cause of equal justice to all men, and for the protection of the weak against the oppressive domination of the strong. Perhaps America, clothed in her right mind, is yet to lead the nations along the upward path of a true civilization. The vision may tarry; but it will surely come, and the unexpected is always on the way and may be just around the corner.

RESOLUTIONS.

On motion of Mr. David Greene Haskins, Jr., the following resolution was passed:

The Anti-Imperialist League, at the beginning of its seventh year of life, consecrates itself anew with fresh ardor and enthusiasm to the great work it has undertaken in defence of the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the United States Constitution. It believes that Jefferson and the other fathers of the Republic were right when they declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; and that the apologists for imperialism are wrong when they defend a policy that forces them to explain away and ridicule the Declaration of Independence,—just as the apologists for slavery did in Abraham Lincoln's time.

It believes that education is greatly needed today in the United States, as well as in the Philippine Islands; and that its mission is to assist in educating public opinion here. Patiently and enthusiastically it will continue its work,—seeking to convince the people that American government of the Philippines is unjust to the Filipinos; harmful to our national ideals; the cause of widespread discontent and distress in the Islands; and the occasion of vast and unnecessary expense.

The League has faith in the American people; and believes that when they realize that the thing is wrong they will abandon it. It earnestly invites the sympathy and the active co-operation of all men and women,—whatever their party relations or former views,—who really desire to hold the country true to American ideals. It asks, at the least, a fair and candid hearing on this great question from every patriotic citizen.

The League must make no compromises,—whatever others may do. Its lofty standard cannot be lowered. It can accept no ambiguous and misleading talk of "self-government." It stands firmly for an immediate pledge of early independence for the Philippines.

The cause will surely prevail. Sooner or later independence will come; and the sooner the definite and binding pledge is given, the better it will be for the Filipinos; the better it will be for the United States.

On motion of the Rev. William R. Lord the following resolution was passed:

Resolved: That the Anti-Imperialist League, at its annual meeting, wishes to spread upon its records an expression of appreciation of the untiring and effective services of its able Secretary, Mr. Erving Winslow.

The meeting was then dissolved.

The Executive Committee, as authorized by the Constitution of the Anti-Imperialist League, having elected additional vice-presidents since the Annual Meeting, the list now stands as follows:

ALABAMA.

Prof. Edgar B. Kay, Tuscaloosa.

ALASKA.

F. C. Hammond, Esq., Juneau.

ARIZONA.

Frank P. Trott, Esq., Phoenix.

ARKANSAS.

Hon. James K. Jones, Washington.
Hon. U. M. Rose, Little Rock.

CALIFORNIA.

C. F. Lummis, Esq., Los Angeles.
Hon. Warren Olney, Oakland.
William H. Rogers, Esq., San Jose.

COLORADO.

Hon. Moses Hallett, Denver.
Gen. W. J. Palmer, Colorado Springs.
Hon. John F. Shafroth, Denver.
Hon. C. S. Thomas, Denver.

CONNECTICUT.

Prof. Henry Wade Rogers, New Haven.
Prof. W. G. Sumner, New Haven.
Hon. Charles F. Thayer, Norwich.

DELAWARE.

Hon. Richard R. Kenney, Dover.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Gen. William Birney, Washington.
Dr. W. A. Croffut, Washington.
Samuel Gompers, Esq., Washington.
Gen. Nelson A. Miles, Washington.

FLORIDA.

Hon. Thomas M. Shackleford, Tallahassee.

GEORGIA.

Hon. Peter W. Meldrim, Savannah.
Hon. Hoke Smith, Atlanta.

ILLINOIS.

Miss Jane Addams, Chicago.
Prof. Ira W. Howerth, Chicago.
Louis F. Post, Esq., Chicago.
Prof. Wm. M. Salter, Chicago.
Edwin Burritt Smith, Esq., Chicago.
Charles M. Sturges, Esq., Chicago.
Sigmund Zeisler, Esq., Chicago.

INDIANA.

Hon. H. U. Johnson, Richmond.

IOWA.

Hon. Horace Boies, Waterloo.
Dean Amos N. Currier, Iowa City.
Hon. Cato Sells, Vinton.
Hon. Henry Vollmer, Davenport.

KANSAS.

Hugh P. Farrelly, Esq., Chanute.

LOUISIANA.

Hon. Donelson Caffery, Franklin.

MAINE.

President George C. Chase, Lewiston.
Dr. Seth C. Gordon, Portland.
Hon. Luther F. McKinney, Bridgeton.

MARYLAND.

Hon. John V. LeMoyne, Baltimore.
Hon. George L. Wellington, Cumberland.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Dr. Edward Atkinson, Boston.
Rev. L. W. Bacon, Assonet.
Samuel Bowles, Esq., Springfield.
Hon. D. H. Chamberlain, West Brookfield.
Col. C. R. Codman, Brookline.
Rev. C. F. Dole, Jamaica Plain.
Dana Estes, Esq., Boston.
President G. Stanley Hall, Worcester.
J. M. Head, Esq., Boston.
Col. T. W. Higginson, Cambridge.
Prof. William James, Cambridge.
Henry W. Lamb, Esq., Brookline.
Edwin D. Mead, Esq., Boston.
Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, Boston.
Hon. R. M. Morse, Boston.
James P. Munroe, Esq.. Boston.

Prof. Charles Eliot Norton, Cambridge.
Gen. Francis A. Osborn, Boston.
Henry Pickering, Esq., Boston.
Hon. Moorfield Storey, Boston.
Hon. Winslow Warren, Boston.

MICHIGAN.

Rev. J. H. Crooker, Ann Arbor.

MINNESOTA.

Frederic G. Corser, Esq., Minneapolis.
Hon. John Lind, Minneapolis.
Rev. Henry M. Simmons, Minneapolis.

MISSISSIPPI.

Hon. John S. Williams, Yazoo.

MISSOURI.

John P. Herrmann, Esq., St. Louis.

MONTANA.

Andrew Dunsire, Esq., Kalispell.

NEBRASKA.

A. S. Sawyer, Esq., Lincoln.
Rt. Rev. Arthur S. Williams, Omaha.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Hon. Henry F. Hollis, Concord.

NEW JERSEY.

Ralph W. E. Donges, Esq., Camden.

NEW YORK.

Everett V. Abbot, Esq., New York.
Andrew Carnegie, Esq., New York.
E. H. Crosby, Esq., New York.
R. Fulton Cutting, Esq., New York.
Charles Stewart Davison, Esq., New York.
Hon. Louis R. Ehrich, New York.
Col. Patrick Ford, New York.
Henry W. Hardon, Esq., New York.
Rev. William R. Huntington, New York.
Mrs. Charles Russell Lowell, New York.
Rev. C. H. Parkhurst, New York.
Hon. Carl Schurz, New York.
Hon. George F. Seward, New York.
Horace White, Esq., New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

President L. L. Hobbs, Guilford.

NORTH DAKOTA.

A. C. Reinecke, Esq., Grand Forks.

OHIO.

Gen. Roeliff Brinkerhoff, Mansfield.
Hon. John J. Lentz, Columbus.
Hon. Rufus B. Smith, Cincinnati.
Edward Stang, Esq., Cincinnati.
Charles B. Wilby, Esq., Cincinnati.

OKLAHOMA.

Dr. D. H. Patton, Woodward.

OREGON.

James Hennessy Murphy, Esq., Portla
C. E. S. Wood, Esq., Portland.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Dr. W. Horace Hoskins, Philadelp
Hon. Alfred H. Love, Philadelphia.
George G. Mercer, Esq., Philadelphi
George W. Ochs, Esq., Philadelphi
Mickle C. Paul, Esq., Philadelphia.
Frank Stephens, Esq., Philadelphia
Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson, Philadelp
Herbert Welsh, Esq., Philadelphia.

RHODE ISLAND.

Hon. Lucius F. C. Garvin, Provide
Rt. Rev. W. N. McVickar, Provide
Edwin C. Pierce, Esq., Providenc

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Brig. Gen. James Gadsden Holm Charles
Wilie Jones, Esq., Columbus.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Hon. Levi McGee, Rapid City.
Joseph B. Moore, Esq., Lead.

TENNESSEE.

Hon. E. W. Carmack, Memphis.

TEXAS.

Frederick Opp, Esq., Llano.
Hon. James L. Slayden, San Anto

VERMONT.

Col. A. P. Childs, Bennington.
Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, Burlington

VIRGINIA.

President George H. Denny, Lexing

WASHINGTON.

C. G. Heifner, Esq., Seattle.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Hon. A. S. Johnston, Union.
Hon. John E. Stealey, Clarksburg

WISCONSIN.

William George Bruce, Esq., Milwau

WYOMING.

Hon. John C. Hamm, Cheyenne.

PATENTED
APR. 21, 1903